

342.415
M25W

3^{d.} Net.

HOME RULE IN A NUTSHELL.

A POCKET BOOK
FOR SPEAKERS
AND ELECTORS.

BY

JEREMIAH MACVEAGH, M.P.

Return this book on or before the
Latest Date stamped below.

University of Illinois Library

NOV - 3 1958

JUN - 5 1962

FEB 26 1980

FEB 28 1980

FEB 28 1980

HOME RULE IN A NUTSHELL.

A POCKET BOOK FOR SPEAKERS AND
ELECTORS.

*CONTAINING A BRIEF EXPOSITION
OF THE ARGUMENTS FOR HOME
RULE, AND ANSWERS TO THE
OBJECTIONS RAISED. :: :: ::*

BY

JEREMIAH MACVEAGH, M.P.

Dublin;

SEALY, BRYERS & WALKER, 86 Middle Abbey Street.

London:

IRISH PRESS AGENCY, 2 Great Smith Street, S.W.

1911.

342.415

M254

PREFACE.

13 F 28
In the following pages I have endeavoured to present a bird's-eye view of the case for Home Rule for Ireland. It would be impossible, within such a compass, to treat exhaustively, or even adequately, of the many pressing reasons in favour of Reform, or of all the side-issues which have been raised by its opponents; but I have sought to cover all the main points. As will be seen, I have not aimed at literary effect; my object has been to collate the facts in a popular form, and to leave the reader to follow up in other quarters any particular branch of the subject which may appeal to him. If the little volume should prove of service as a Primer for the Student, or for "the Man in the Street," or as a Reference Handbook for the Speaker or the Writer on the Irish Question, it will have fully accomplished its purpose.

JEREMIAH MACVEAGH.

House of Commons,

September, 1911.

55355

INDEX.

	PAGE
Act of Union, Failure of	6
Act of Union, how carried	4
Act of Union, Legislative Fruits of	7
Afforestation	39
American Dollars	72
American, Irish	73
Arbitration Treaty	22
Arterial Drainage	36
Ascendancy, Episcopalian	44
Australia and Home Rule	18
 Balfour, A. J., on Destruction of Irish Industries ..	7
Balfour, Gerald, on Working of Local Government ..	40
Belfast Prosperity	62
Belgium, Comparison with Ireland	14
Belgium, Drainage in	37
Birth Rate in Ireland	22
Birth Rate, Illegitimate	66
Boards, Government, Number of	10
Boycotting	60
Bright, John, on Land System	26
Bright, John, on Ulster Tories	45
Butt on Act of Union	5
 Campbell Bannerman, Sir H., on Self Government ..	3
Canada and Home Rule	18
Capacity for Government	39
Carnarvon, Lord, and Home Rule	77
Cattle driving	58
Chamberlain, Mr. J., Home Ruler before Gladstone ..	19

	PAGE
Chamberlain, Mr., on System of Government	20
Chief Secretaries, Number of	19
Clanricarde Evictions	25
Clare, Lord, on Irish Parliament	8
Coercion Acts, Number of	42
Coercion, the only alternative to Home Rule	42
Colonies and Home Rule	16
Cost of Government	13
Crime	56
Derby, Lord, on English Concessions	35
Dicey, Professor, on Act of Union	5
Discontent	26
Disease	22
Disestablishment Threats	67
Disintegration of Empire	47, 1
Disloyalty Bogey	48
Dominions and Home Rule	16
Dudley, Earl of, on Irish Government	11
Dudley, Earl of, and Home Rule	76
Education in Ulster	66
Education, Neglect of	30
Emigration	22
Emigration from Ulster	63
Empire and Home Rule	16, 47, 1
Empire, the "Integrity" Bogey	1, 16, 47
England, Cost of Government	13
England, Population of	21
Episcopalian Ascendancy	44
Evictions	24
Famines	26
Federalism, Tory newspapers on	78
Financial Relations	27
Ford, Patrick	72
Forestry	39
Fox on Act of Union	5

	PAGE
Gladstone on Act of Union	5
Goldwin Smith on Orangeism	53
Gordon, General, on Condition of People	23
Government in Ireland, System of	10
Grattan on Liberty	3
Grazing Ranch System	58
Holland, Waste Lands in	38
Home Rule	1
Identity of Interests, Absence of	4
Ignoring Irish Opinion, Result of	33
Illegitimacy	66
Imperial Unity	1, 16, 47
Industries, Effect of Union on	7
Insanity	23
Insurrections	26
Integrity of Empire	1, 16, 47
Intermediate Education	31
Intolerance, Religious	50
Irish Industries, Mr. Balfour on English Destruction of	7
Jebb, Judge, on Irish Parliament	9
King George's Reception in Ireland	49
Land System	22, 24, 25
Lansdowne, Lord, and Lord MacDonnell	76
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, on Home Rule,	18
Law and Justice, Cost of	13
Lawlessness	56
Lecky on Act of Union	4
Lecky on Ireland's Share in Social Reforms	43
Lecky on Irish Parliament	9
Legislative Effects of Union	10
Llandaff, Lord, and O'Donovan Rossa	73

	PAGE
Local Government Board, Cost of	13
Local Government, Success of	40
Loyalty in Ireland	48
Loyal Ulster	66
MacDonnell, Lord, as Under-Secretary	76
Marriage Rate	22
Nationality, Spirit of	3
O'Donovan Rossa and Tories	73
Officials, Number of	14
Orangeism	53
Parliamentary Machine, Breakdown of	15
Parliament of 1782	8
Parliaments in the Empire, Number of	17
Parliament—What an Irish might do	36
Parnell on Home Rule	1
Parson, Ascendancy of	44
Pauperism	23
Persecution, Religious	50
Pigott and Tories	72
Plunkett, Lord, on Irish Parliament	9
Police, Cost of	13
Poor Law System,	34
Population, Decrease in	21
Population, Decrease in Ulster	63, 64
Poverty	23
"Priests in Politics"	52
Primary Education	31
Private Bill Legislation	16
Railway System	37
Reclamation of Waste Lands	38
Redistribution	43
Redmond, J. E., on Loyalty	48
Redmond, J. E., on Taxation	28
Redmond, J. E., on "the Strong Hand"	54

	PAGE
Referendum	43
Religious Denominations, Population of	46
Religious Intolerance	50
Rentoul, Judge, on Ulster Tory Threats	71
"Rome Rule"	51
Roosevelt and Ireland	19
Russell, Lord John, on Evictions	24
Russell, Lord John, on Land System	—
Salisbury, Lord, and Home Rule	76
Salisbury, Lord, on Irish Government	35
<i>Saturday Review</i> on Financial Relations	29
Scotland, Cost of Government	13
Scotland, Poor in	23
Scotland, Population of	21
Scotland, Wages in	24
Sectarian Intolerance	50
Separation	1
"Separation" Bogey	47
Social Reforms in Great Britain, Attitude of Irish	43
South Africa and Home Rule	16
Spirit of Nationality	3
"Strong Hand" Speech by J. E. Redmond	54
<i>Sydney Bulletin</i> on Grazing System	58
Taft, President, and Ireland	19
Taxation	27
Taxes, proposed strike against	72
Taxes, Tory Strike against	72
Technical Education	31
<i>Times</i> on Irish Landlords	25
Tories and Home Rule	76
Tories and O'Donovan Rossa	73
Tories and Parnell	77
Tories and Patrick Ford	72
Tories and Pigott	72
Tory newspapers on Federalism	78
Transit Facilities	37

	PAGE
Ulster "Civil War" Bogey	67
Ulster, Education in	66
Ulster, Emigration from	63
Ulster, Law-abiding	65
Ulster Loyalty,	66
Ulster, Morality in	66
Ulster not Prosperous	62
Ulster not Protestant	61
Ulster not Unionist	61
Ulster Tories and Disestablishment	67
Ulster Tories and Loyalty	67
Ulster Tories and Military Service	70
Ulster Tories and Orangeism	71
Ulster Tories and Social Reform	44
Ulster Tories, John Bright on	45
Ulster, Wealth in	62
Union, Act of, how carried	4
Union, Act of: Lecky, Gladstone, Fox, Dickey, Butt on	4, 5
Union, Failure of Act of	6
Union, Legislative Fruits of	10
University Education	32
Wages in Ireland	24
Waring, Col., on Ulster Tory Threats	71
Waste Lands	38
West Ridgeway, Sir J., on System of Government	12
What Home Rule means	1
Wyndham, Geo., and Lord MacDonnell	76
Wyndham, Geo., on Working of Local Government	40

HOME RULE IN A NUTSHELL.

WHAT HOME RULE MEANS.

Home Rule means Self-Government, but does *not* mean Separation. Home Rule means that the Irish people should govern themselves, through an Executive responsible to a Parliament, in all purely Irish affairs. But an Irish Parliament would have nothing to say regarding the Army, or the Navy, or Treaties, or Foreign or Colonial affairs. These matters would be dealt with by the Imperial Parliament, in which (*pending Home Rule for Scotland, Wales, and England*) Ireland would have a reduced representation; and the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament over the Irish Parliament would be undisputed and indisputable.

Mr. Parnell said on June 7th, 1886 :—

“ The right hon. gentleman, the Member for East Edinburgh (Mr. Goschen), spoke about the sovereignty of Parliament. I entirely agree upon that point. We have always known the difference between a co-ordinate and a subordinate Parliament, and we have always recognised that the legislature which the Prime Minister proposes to constitute is a subordinate Parliament. You leave the power and supremacy of Parliament untouched and unimpaired just as though this Bill had never been brought forward. We fully recognise this to be the effect of the Bill, and I now repeat what I have always said, that the Irish people have accepted it as a settlement.”

And such has been the position of the Nationalists from that day to this. Last October Mr. Redmond went to America to collect the American dollars, of which so much was said. To explain precisely his aims to American people he published in "M'Clure's Magazine" for October—the magazine having the widest circulation in America—the following passage :—

" Here, then, is ' what Ireland wants ' : ' Legislative and executive control of all purely Irish affairs, subject to the supreme authority of the Imperial Parliament.' In other words, we want an Irish Parliament, with an executive responsible to it, created by Act of the Imperial Parliament, and charged with the management of purely Irish affairs (land, education, local government, transit, labour, industries, taxation for local purposes, law and justice, police, &c.), leaving to the Imperial Parliament, in which Ireland would probably continue to be represented, but in smaller numbers, the management, just as at present, of all imperial affairs—army, navy, foreign relations, customs, Imperial taxation, matters pertaining to the Crown, the Colonies, and all those other questions which are Imperial and not local in their nature, the Imperial Parliament also retaining an over-riding supreme authority over the new Irish legislature, such as it possesses to-day over the various legislatures in Canada, Australia, South Africa, and other portions of the Empire."

WHY IRELAND SHOULD HAVE HOME RULE.

Many reasons will be found in the following pages, but one of the best of all democratic reasons is—*because she wants it*, and because since the passing of the Act of Union in 1800 she has never ceased to demand it.

THE SPIRIT OF NATIONALITY.

The spirit of Nationality demands self-government, and that spirit cannot be eradicated. Nationality may be only a sentiment, but sentiment rules the world, and no wise statesman seeks to ignore it. Centuries of oppression have failed to suppress Irish Nationality; it has spoken from the battlefield, from the felon's cell, from the scaffold, from the platform, from the ballot-box, from the Senate. The impulse of Nationality comes from higher than earthly powers, and is indestructible. If the results of the Act of Union had been as good as they have been bad, Ireland would still yearn for the recognition of Nationality—just as the British people would yearn for it, and fight for it, if they were being wisely governed by German archangels in Berlin. "Good Government," said Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, "is no substitute for self-government"; and judged by results, the government of Ireland has been bad beyond comparison.

"I would trust," said Henry Grattan, "any people with the custody of its own liberty. I would trust no people with the custody of liberty other than its own;" and, again: "Government without the consent of the governed is the very definition of slavery."

NO IDENTITY.

Moreover, there is no identity—national, historical, religious, commercial, industrial, or geographical—between Great Britain and Ireland. The national characteristics are different. The economic conditions are also different, for Great Britain is rich, whilst Ireland is poor; Great Britain is a manufacturing country, whilst Ireland is agricultural. The same laws and the same taxation are obviously unsuited for the two countries.

HOW THE UNION WAS CARRIED.

That Act of Union was carried by the most colossal turpitude that history records. “A process of blackguardism and baseness,” Gladstone called it. Lecky, the historian (himself an Irish Unionist M.P.), declared that “all the unbribed intellect of Ireland” was against that measure. It was passed into law by unexampled bribery, corruption, and fraud. Lord Grey recorded that no less than 116 of the 162 Members of the Irish Parliament who supported the Act of Union had been bribed by Pitt and Castlereagh with offices, pensions, or peerages. About a million and a quarter was thus spent, and the amount was actually charged against Ireland! Hear Lecky:—

“The years between 1779 and 1798 were probably the most prosperous in Irish history, and the generation which followed the Union was one of the most miserable. The sacrifice of Nationality was extorted by the most enormous corruption in the history of representative institutions. It was demanded by no considerable

portion of the Irish people; it was accompanied by no signal, political or material benefit that could mitigate or counteract its unpopularity; and it was effected without a Dissolution, in opposition to the immense majority of the representatives of the counties and considerable towns, and to the innumerable addresses from every part of the country. Whatever may be thought of the abstract merits of the Act of Union as it was carried, it was a crime of the deepest turpitude, which, by imposing with every circumstance of infamy a new form of government on a reluctant and protesting nation, has vitiated the whole course of Irish opinion."

That eminent Unionist, Professor A. V. Dicey, wrote in the *Fortnightly Review* in August, 1881:—

"The Act of Union was, in short, an agreement which, could it have been referred to a court of law, must at once have been cancelled as *a contract hopelessly tainted with fraud and corruption.*"

Mr. Fox, in 1806, characterised the Union as "atrocious in its principle and abominable in its means." "It was," he said, "a measure the most disgraceful to the Government of the country that was ever carried or proposed." (*Morning Chronicle*, February 4th, 1806).

Mr. Gladstone said:—"I know *no blacker or fouler transaction in the history of man* than the making of the Union between England and Ireland." (Speech at Liverpool, November 28th, 1886).

"With the testimony of all history," said Mr. Butt, "I

may assume that the Union was carried by a system of force, fraud, and corruption for which no parallel is to be found in the history of a nation which was even nominally free." (*Freeman's Journal*, 19th November, 1873).

For Irishmen, therefore, the Act of Union has no binding moral or legal force. They regard it as their fathers regarded it before them, as a great criminal act of usurpation, carried by violence and by fraud; and they say that no lapse of time, and no mitigation of its details can ever make it binding upon honour or conscience. Resistance to the Act of Union will always remain for them, so long as that Act lasts, a sacred duty.

FAILURE OF THE ACT OF UNION.

The Act of Union has been a stupendous failure, has crushed Irish trade and industries, has weighted the country with intolerable taxation, has substituted poverty for wealth. has dispersed the Irish race all over the world, and has maintained discontent and disaffection.

Here are a few figures which show how the development of Irish industries has been affected since the Union. In Dublin in the year 1800 there were 90 master woollen manufacturers, employing 4,918 hands; and in the year 1840 the industry was practically dead. There were, in 1800, 39 master wool-combers in Dublin, employing 230 hands; while in 1834 the industry was practically dead. There were 13 carpet manufacturers in Dublin in 1800, employing 230 hands, and in 1841 there were none. In the town of Kilkenny there were to be found, in 1800, 56 blanket manufacturers, employing 3,000 hands; and in the year 1822 the

industry was gone. In Dublin, in the year 1800, there were 2,500 silk loom weavers at work, and in 1840 the industry was gone. In the year 1799 there were 2,500 calico looms at work in Balbriggan; in 1841 there were but 228. In Wicklow, in 1800, there were 1,000 hand-looms at work; in 1841 there were none. In the City of Cork there were at work in the year 1800 the following industries, which had since declined :—1,000 braid weavers, of whom only 49 remained in 1834; 2,000 worsted weavers, of whom only 90 remained in 1834; 3,000 hosiers, of whom only 28 remained in 1834. There were also 700 wool-combers, 2,000 cotton weavers, and 600 linen check weavers, each of which industries was dead in 1834. All these industries which were in existence at the time of the Union had either totally disappeared or had been partially destroyed before the year 1841.

DESTRUCTION OF IRISH INDUSTRIES.

Mr. Arthur Balfour, in a remarkable speech made some years ago in England, admitted that England had deliberately destroyed Irish industries. History proves it. So far back as the middle of the seventeenth century England began to legislate to destroy Irish industries. At that time, and after, Irish industries were beating England in her own markets. But England, as soon as she realised that, instantly proceeded to impose duties upon every Irish manufacture in turn, in order to destroy them. The great woollen industry of Ireland was destroyed by an Act of the English Parliament. Previous to that the cattle industry had been destroyed; and when they were no

longer able to export live stock from Ireland, the Irish people commenced to make preserved meat and bacon, and, as soon as that was prosperous, that industry was attacked by England, and similarly destroyed. Every industry to which the Irish people had recourse was dealt with in the same way. Cotton, glass, iron, hats, sugar refining, shipbuilding—every industry to which Ireland turned was destroyed by England by the imposition of prohibitive duties or by the closing of ports. The Colonial and Indian markets were closed absolutely against Ireland, and prohibitive duties were placed upon all Irish manufactures to keep them out of the English markets. “One by one of each of our nascent industries,” observes Lord Dufferin, “was either strangled in its birth or handed over, gagged and bound, to the jealous custody of the rival interests of England, until at last every fountain of wealth was hermetically sealed, and even the traditions of commercial enterprise have perished through desuetude.”

These industries were strangled, and the evil cannot be undone in generations or by any other power than an Irish Legislature.

PROSPERITY THE HANDMAID OF FREEDOM.

Compare that record with the experience of Ireland from 1782 to 1800, when she had a Parliament. When an Irish Parliament was given full powers, its use of them exceeded all anticipation. Lord Clare made this admission in 1798, concerning the system which he was fated to destroy:—

“There is not a nation on the face of the habitable globe which has advanced in cultivation, in manufac-

tures, with the same rapidity in the same period as Ireland.”

Judge Jebb, another distinguished man, in a pamphlet published in the same year wrote :—

“ In the course of fifteen years our commerce, our agriculture, and our manufactures have swelled to an amount that the most sanguine friends of Ireland could not have dared to prognosticate.”

Lord Plunkett, in 1799, said :—

“ Ireland’s revenues, her trade, her manufactures, had thriven beyond the hope or the example of any other country of her extent, within these few years [before the Union], advancing with a rapidity astonishing even to herself.”

The Bankers of Dublin held a meeting on December 18th, 1798, at which they passed the following resolution :—

“ Resolved, that since the renunciation of the power of Great Britain in 1782 to legislate for Ireland, the commerce and prosperity of this kingdom have eminently increased.”

And Lecky wrote in his History :—

“ From the concession of free trade in 1779 to the Rebellion of 1798, the national progress of Ireland was rapid and uninterrupted. *In ten years from 1782 the exports more than trebled.*”

LEGISLATIVE FRUITS OF THE UNION.

Parliament has found it necessary to pass, since the Act of Union, 11 Acts for the direct relief, otherwise than by the ordinary poor law, of exceptionally extreme poverty, and consequent distress; ten for the indirect relief of poverty by means of advancing money for public works; four for giving the extremely poor employment at the public expense; four for contending with famine fever; four for saving from perishing by starvation the thousands of children deserted through the abject poverty of their parents; three for the relief and assistance of railway companies otherwise unable to proceed with their works; four for the artificial assistance of banks, and for sustaining commercial credit; and four for the rescue of encumbered estates from hopeless insolvency—making in all 43 Acts in acknowledgment of the ruin and despair that have haunted all sorts and conditions of men.

HOW IRELAND IS GOVERNED TO-DAY.

The Government of Ireland consists of a series of Bureaus, each independent of the other, and most of them absolutely irresponsible. There are, in all, some *sixty-seven Boards, Departments, and Offices*: in fact, Ireland, as has been said, has *enough Boards to make her coffin*. Some of these bodies are responsible solely to the British Government; some of them are local branches of English Boards and English Departments responsible to the head officials in London; some of them are responsible in theory to the Chief Secretary. One can imagine what the feelings of a new Chief Secretary must be

for the first week or two he is in office on finding every morning he awakes that he is President of a new Department or Board, which he has never heard of before, whose officials he has never met, whose work he has no conception of, and for whom he is in theory responsible to Parliament. *Of Boards alone there are about a score.* No man living could in reality make himself responsible for the work of these Boards. They are worked by permanent officials; and when the Chief Secretary comes to the House of Commons all he can do is to read the answers sent to him by the Government officials.

The Irish people have not the slightest voice in the management of any of these Boards or Departments.

It was of this system that Mr. Joseph Chamberlain said in 1885 :—

“ The time has come to reform the absurd and irritating anachronism which is known as Dublin Castle; to sweep away altogether these alien boards of foreign officials, and to substitute for them a genuine Irish Administration for purely Irish affairs.”

And it was of this system that the Earl of Dudley, whom the Unionists sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, declared :—

“ The only way to govern Ireland properly is to govern it according to Irish ideas instead of according to British ideas.”

Lord Dudley also said (November 20th, 1902) :—

“ There were those who seemed to believe that the only way in which a great Empire could be successfully

maintained was by suppressing the various distinguishing elements of its component parts—in fact, by running it as a huge regiment, in which each nation was to lose its own individuality, and to be brought under a common system of discipline. That was not his view. In his opinion they were much more likely to break up an Empire by any such attempt. Lasting strength and loyalty were not to be secured by any attempt to force into one system or to mould into one type those special characteristics which were the outcome of a nation's history, but rather by a full recognition of the fact that those very characteristics formed an essential part of the nation's life, and that under wise guidance and sympathetic treatment they would enable her to play her own special part in the life of the Empire to which she belonged. It was upon that principle that he would proceed during his term of office, believing that any national development to be lasting or healthy must be spontaneous."

Sir West Ridgeway, who was Under-Secretary for Ireland under various Conservative Governments, declared :—

"I went to Ireland with an open mind free from bias, and there were soon impressed upon it certain facts. I quickly realised that the system was deficient and cumbersome, and that the gulf which yawned between the people and the Government could only be bridged by associating the people with the government of their own affairs."

Sir Redvers Buller, Sir R. Hamilton, and other Under-Secretaries have also placed similar views on record.

COST OF IRISH GOVERNMENT.

The government of Ireland is the costliest and most extravagant in the world. *England and Wales have ten times the population of Ireland, and the population of Scotland is about the same as that of Ireland.* And Ireland, even comparatively, is much poorer than England or Scotland. Yet, according to a Treasury Statement in the House of Commons on April 8th, 1907, Civil Government in England and Wales costs only 10s. 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ d. per head of the population, whilst that of Ireland costs £1 1s. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. per head!

Under the head of Law and Justice, provision is made in the Estimates for £2,454,866 for England and Wales, £388,699 for Scotland, and no less than £2,505,375 for Ireland!

The police for England and Wales cost 3s. 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ d. per head of the population, for Scotland the figure is 2s. 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ d., and for Ireland it is actually 6s. 8d.!

The Local Government Board costs £284,844 for England and Wales, £18,359 for Scotland, and £102,524 for Ireland!

The Department of the Secretary for Scotland costs £42,792 a year, but the Departments of the Lord Lieutenant and Chief Secretary for Ireland absorb £83,084, the Lord Lieutenant receiving £20,000 allowance, just double the salary of the President of the United States of America.

The Department of the Registrar-General for Scotland entails a vote of £9.062 a year, whilst the same Department in Ireland accounts for £17,543!

And so on through every branch of Irish Government. The administration is thus *immeasurably more costly than the government of other small nations of Europe, such as*

Norway, Sweden, Holland, Denmark, and so forth; and the mere Civil Government of Ireland costs more than the whole cost of the government (home and foreign), Army and Navy, Royal Family, and so forth, of Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, or Greece.

The cost of "Irish Services defrayed out of Imperial funds" rose in the ten years between 1895 and 1905 from £5,939,000 to £7,635,500.

Belgium, with four times the trade of Ireland, and with a much larger population, is governed at about half the cost of the crazy and inefficient system maintained in Ireland. And what a contrast! Belgium well governed, rich and contented. Ireland poor, naturally discontented, and so badly governed that Dublin Castle has become a by-word in the mouths of all men.

Ireland is ruined by the present system. The British Empire does not gain by it. The only class that does profit by it is a horde of officials.

Scotland at present has a larger population than Ireland. But of *Government officials assessed for income tax there are in Scotland 938, in Ireland 4,560*. Their salaries are in Scotland £315,000; in Ireland £1,435,000. These are the official figures given in the Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for 1908.

The sixty-seven departments and offices employ very nearly 100,000 officials, and have handed over to them seven and a half millions of money for the government of the country.

It is squandered unchecked and unchallenged, for although there is a nominal Parliamentary control, it amounts to three days a year devoted to Irish Supply, and then generally

to questions of policy. Some of the votes have not been discussed for generations.

The excessive cost of Irish government can be illustrated in another way. Of her national income of £1,800,000,000 a year, England spends less than one-fortieth part on her home government. Of her national income of £70,000,000 a year, Ireland is forced to spend on her home government more than one-tenth.

Under the present system no one in Ireland has any interest in economising in the Government, because every penny economised in the Government, under the present system, goes, not to the Irish people, but back into the Treasury.

THE PARLIAMENTARY MACHINE.

The Parliamentary machine at Westminster has practically broken down. Only about one day in the year can be spared to the Scottish Estimates, or the administration of Egypt, or the great Empire of India, or other matters of equally vital importance; but time can be found, and is found, for debating at great length whether the advowson of an English rectory should be sold, whether the designs of a new bridge over the Thames are æsthetic and artistic, whether the finances of the Borough of Sligo are sound, whether the township of Rathmines is all that it should be, and so forth. The Empire must be neglected in order that the Parish Pump may be attended to.

That system is bad for Great Britain and bad for Ireland. It is even worse for Ireland than for Great Britain, for Irish affairs, national or parochial, are necessarily decided by men of whom few have ever seen Ireland, who know absolutely nothing of the country, and care less.

If new sewers are to be laid in an Irish town, or a new tramway system started, or an electrical system to be installed, the local authority must come to Westminster, and brief eminent counsel at the Parliamentary Bar, and pay huge fees in all directions; and frequently the lawyers and experts have to be told how to pronounce the names of the towns about which they are arguing. A few years ago, for example, a Bill for the amalgamation of three Irish Railways was before Parliament for three sessions, had to run the gauntlet of three Parliamentary Committees, and cost nearly £100,000. It could have been disposed of in Dublin in a tenth of the time and at a twentieth of the cost.

Every day the sittings of the House of Commons furnish an argument in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. There is a congestion of work there, growing rapidly day by day, which is showing the English people that if they do not lighten the load by sending local affairs home to Ireland, to Scotland, and to Wales, for management, representative institutions in England will sink beneath the burden. The everyday experience of the House of Commons constitutes argument in favour of Home Rule for Ireland, and it is being pressed upon the minds of Englishmen.

THE COLONIES AND HOME RULE.

Speakers on Unionist platforms are for ever appealing to the electors to hearken to the voice of the Colonies. They urge the merits of Colonial preference, and wax eloquent on the necessity for binding more closely the Colonies and the Mother Country.

Will they listen to the voice of the Colonies on Home Rule?

Every Colony in the British Empire is in favour of giving Self-Government to Ireland. Every Prime Minister at the Imperial Conference was a Home Ruler, and all of them were the guests of the Irish Party at a banquet given in their honour. The Colonies are in favour of Irish Home Rule because they themselves have Home Rule, and know the blessings which follow in its train.

Home Rule has been the salvation of the British Empire. Where it was granted, the possessions were retained; where it was refused (as in the case of the United States) the possessions were lost.

France, Spain, Holland, and Portugal insisted on governing their Dependencies from Paris, Madrid, The Hague, and Lisbon, respectively—and lost them. Great Britain allowed her Colonies to work out their own destiny, and to-day they are indissolubly knit in the bonds of Empire.

There are already twenty-eight Parliaments in the British Empire, including even Alderney and Sark and the Isle of Man; and it will survive the addition of another in Dublin. The Empire is strong because of its twenty-eight Parliaments; it will be still stronger with twenty-nine, for Ireland will then be a source of strength. instead of, as to-day, a source of weakness.

These twenty-eight Parliaments are not inclusive of nine Colonies, which have partial self-government through partly elected, partly nominated Legislatures, or Legislative Councils; in other words, we have to-day, in one form or another, some thirty-seven Home Rule constitutions within the Empire!

Home Rule begets Loyalty and Prosperity; the withholding of it spells Decadence, Discontent, Disloyalty, Re-

bellion. Canada won Home Rule at the point of the sword, but the Canadian Rebels became the most loyal of subjects, and Canada one of the brightest jewels in the British Crown.

The Canadian Parliament has, on no less than five occasions—in 1882, in 1884, in 1886, in 1887, in 1903—passed resolutions in sympathy with the demand of Ireland for Home Rule.

The Australian House of Representatives and the Senate of the Australian Commonwealth petitioned the late King Edward in the same sense. South Africa a few years ago was being drenched in human blood; but the war of races has given place to Home Rule, and General Botha, who led the Boers in the field, is now one of the heroes of the British populace.

Ireland gave Generals and soldiers to fight for Great Britain in South Africa. The Unionist policy is to refuse Home Rule to the race whose soldiers fought by your side, although you have freely given it to those who fought against you.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER ON HOME RULE.

The venerable Canadian statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, has placed his views on record in the following pronouncement :—

“ To-day England has an Empire which is second to none, and which has only been equalled once in the course of history. Now the question is asked many a time, by friends and foes, how will the fabric be maintained, how can it be kept together, and how can so many elements be kept under the sway of the Empire of Great Britain? That, however, is a question no

longer to be asked. It is a question answered sixty years ago, when the principle of local autonomy and legislative independence was introduced in all parts of the British Empire. *The Empire of Rome fell by concentration; but the Empire of England exists by freedom, by local autonomy, by legislative independence.*"

THE SYMPATHY OF THE CIVILISED WORLD.

The Irish demand for Self-Government has the sympathy of every civilised country in the world; and wherever the envoys of the Irish Nationalists go, official receptions are tendered to them by the leading public men, including Presidents of the United States like Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft, Governors of the American States, Parliaments, Senates, Statesmen, Judges, Mayors and Municipalities.

CHIEF SECRETARIES.

There have been fifty-four Chief Secretaries in Ireland since 1802. As a rule, the Chief Secretary never sees Ireland till he goes over to govern it; and as soon as he begins to know anything about the country he is transferred to some other post.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN AND HOME RULE.

Mr. Joseph Chamberlain used to boast that he was a Home Ruler before Gladstone. So he was. He said in 1885:—

"I would concede the widest possible measure of democratic Government to the Irish people. Nearly twelve months ago I prepared a scheme with this object, which, in addition to providing for a popular representa-

tive authority throughout the country, proposed also the establishment of a National Legislative Council to which might be referred the administration, supervision, and control which are now exercised by some of the Departments in London, and of those Departments in Ireland which are known commonly under the name of Dublin Castle. I propose to sweep away all the network of Boards appointed by the English Government carrying with them the seed of English authority, whose interference produces so much irritation, so much annoyance, and so much injury to Ireland."

Mr. Chamberlain, speaking at West Islington on the 17th June, 1885, referred to the existing system of government in Ireland as follows:—

"The pacification of Ireland at this moment does, I believe, depend upon the concession to Ireland of the right to govern itself in the matter of its purely domestic business. Now what is the alternative? Are you content, after eighty years of failure, to renew once more the dreary experience of repressive legislation? Is it not discreditable to us that even now it is only by unconstitutional means that we are able to secure peace and order in one portion of Her Majesty's dominions? *I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule a sister country. It is a system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers encamped permanently as in a hostile country. It is a system as completely centralised and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as*

that which was common in Venice under Austrian rule. An Irishman at this moment cannot move a step, he cannot lift a finger in any parochial, municipal, or educational work without being confronted, interfered with, controlled by, an English official appointed by a foreign Government, and without the shadow or shade of representable authority. I say the time has come to reform altogether the absurd and irritating anachronism which is known as Dublin Castle, to sweep away altogether these alien boards of foreign officials, and to substitute for them a genuine Irish Administration for purely Irish business."

THE POPULATION TEST.

There can be no better test of the government or progress of a country than its population. The population of every civilised country, except Ireland, has increased and is increasing. In Ireland it has declined, and is still declining. In 1841 it stood at 8,175,124, but has steadily gone down, until to-day it amounts to only 4,381,951—or barely half. During the same period the population of England and Wales has bounded up from 15,914,148 to 36,075,269, whilst Scotland has increased from 2,620,184 to 4,759,521. *Ireland, in other words, had in 1841 well over one-third of the whole population of the United Kingdom, and nearly three times as many people as Scotland; to-day she has less inhabitants than Scotland, and hardly a tenth of the population of the United Kingdom. Is there in the whole world a parallel to that awful tragedy?*

THE SCOURGE OF EMIGRATION.

The people have fled from the land as if it were stricken with a plague. They have gone in millions, and with bitterness in their hearts; and have carried a sense of their wrongs into every corner of the world. Their children—few of whom have ever seen Ireland—have inherited the feelings of their fathers; and the result of the withholding of justice from Ireland was shown a few years ago in the wrecking by the Irish-Americans of the proposed Treaty between Great Britain and the United States. Every statesman understands the gravity of that situation, but some, in the eagerness of party zeal, pretend to close their eyes to it.

4,236,365 people have emigrated from Ireland since 1851, the earliest year for which official statistics are available, and that figure, therefore, does not include the emigration during the Famine of 1847. The population to-day is 4,381,951; in other words, *the emigration in that period has been greater than the present population!*

And what was the character of that emigration? Nearly 90 per cent. (it was 86·9 per cent. in 1910) of those who leave the country are between the ages of 15 and 35—the very life-blood of the nation. The drain is still going on, for 32,457 people emigrated in 1910.

VITAL STATISTICS.

What of those who remain at home? *The birth-rate of Ireland is the lowest in Europe*, and is still declining. In 1910 it was 22·6 per thousand of the population, whilst in England, Scotland and Wales it was 32 per thousand. The

marriage rate is also going down; in 1910 it was 5·06 per thousand. Grasping landlordism, insanitary dwellings, low wages, poor food, have so debilitated what remains of the race that *serious forms of disease are spreading rapidly in the country*. In 1910 no less than 558 in every 100,000 were classed as “insane under care,” although only thirty years ago the number was as low as 250 per 100,000.

General Gordon wrote from Glengariff, in County Cork, November, 1880 :—

“ I must say, from all accounts and from my own observation, that the state of our fellow-countrymen in the parts I have named is worse than that of any people in the world, let alone Europe. I believe that these people are made as we are—that they are patient beyond belief, loyal, but at the same time broken-spirited and desperate, living on the verge of starvation in places where we would not keep our cattle. The Bulgarians, Anatolians, Chinese, and Indians are better off than many of them are. . . . I am not well off, but I would offer Lord—or his agent £1,000 if either of them would live one week in one of these poor devil’s places, and feed as these people do.”

PAUPERISM.

The number of poor in Scotland has fallen from 41 per thousand in 1868 to 23 per thousand in 1910, and during the same period the proportion of paupers in England has fallen by one-half; but in Ireland it has doubled, and in 1910 one person in every forty-four was subsisting on rate-aid.

WAGES.

Wages are also lower than elsewhere. *Forty-four per cent. of the population is engaged in agriculture, as compared with ten per cent. in Scotland, and eight per cent. in England and Wales*; but the Board of Trade figures show that the average wages of agricultural labourers are 19s. 7d. in Scotland, 18s. 4d. in England, and only 11s. 3d. in Ireland.

Hundreds of thousands of those unable to obtain a living in their own country have come to Great Britain to flood the labour market here.

EVICTIONS.

Under the protection of the British Government, Irish landlords have been allowed since the Act of Union to confiscate the improvements of, and to turn out upon the roadsides, hundreds of thousands of families who had more right to the land from which they were driven than had the landlords who dispossessed them, for it was the tenants who had reclaimed the barren soil, who had drained and fenced it, who had built the houses. These things are done in England by the landlord; in Ireland by the tenant.

Lord John Russell, speaking in the House of Lords on the 23rd March, 1846, said :—

“ More than 50,000 families were in that year turned out of their wretched dwellings without pity and without refuge. We have made Ireland—I speak it deliberately—we have made it the most degraded and the most miserable country in the world. . . . All

the world is crying shame upon us; but we are equally callous to our ignominy, and to the results of our misgovernment."

The iniquitous system of land tenure continued till our own times. The first check was given to it by Gladstone's Irish Land Act of 1881, which was denounced by the Tories as "spoliation," "confiscation," and "robbery" of the landlords' interests. "The very name of Irish landlordism," wrote the *Times*, "stinks in the nostrils of Christendom."

Mr. William Duffy, M.P., who sits for South Galway, writing in the *Glasgow Herald*, March 16th, 1907, says in reference to the Clanricarde Estate:—"Let me summarise what took place, between May, 1879, and February, 1893. *Two hundred and thirty-eight families, approximately 1,500 souls, were evicted.* The costs to the ratepayers of this country included:—1. Police attending evictions, £3,199 6s. 4d.; 2. Affording protection to the emergency men, or "blacklegs," in possession of the evicted tenants' holdings, £14,225 8s. 6d.; 3. Costs of prosecutions arising out of the evictions, £2,902 18s. 11d.; 4. Costs of arrest, conveyance of prisoners to jail, £279 7s.; 5. Cost of prisoners' maintenance in jail, £2,013 13s. 3d.; 6. Amount awarded as "blood-money" to people injured, under the Crimes Act, £4,600; 7. Charge for outdoor relief to evicted tenants on the estate, £283 15s. So that we find the cruel and heartless eviction carried out by this noble absentee landlord between the dates mentioned cost the Government of England no less a sum than £27,895 7s.'

FAMINES.

Largely as a result of the iniquitous Land System which prevailed, the country was swept in 1847 with one of the most terrible famines in the story of the world, and *a million and a half of people were swept away*; but there is not only the history of one great famine: there is the history of constantly recurring famines every few years over a large portion of the west and north-west seaboard of the country.

John Bright, speaking in the House of Commons on August 25, 1848, said :—

“ Let us think of the half-million who within two years past have perished miserably in the workhouses, on the highways, and in their hovels—*more—far more—than ever fell by the sword in any war this country ever waged*: let us think of the crop of nameless horrors which is even now growing up in Ireland, and whose disastrous fruit may be gathered in years and in generations to come.”

POPULAR DISCONTENT.

Take the test of the contentment of the people. There have been since the Union three insurrections, all of them suppressed in blood, with sacrifices untold in the prison cell and upon the scaffold; and at the end of it all to-day it is an admitted fact that the overwhelming majority of the Irish people are thoroughly disaffected.

TAXATION AND FINANCIAL RELATIONS.

Side by side with alarming decrease in population and increase in poverty, walks the spectre of Taxation. Ireland some years ago accused Great Britain of robbing her of several millions a year, and that accusation became so insistent that it was decided to investigate it. A tribunal was appointed for the purpose. Great Britain was the defendant, Great Britain appointed the tribunal. Yet that tribunal, so appointed and constituted, brought in a verdict in favour of Ireland, *a verdict to the effect that Ireland was over-taxed to the extent of about £3,000,000 a year*, and that that had gone on for half a century. That was in 1893-4.

Since then, so far from relief having been given, £3,000,000 additional has been put upon Ireland, and in the most cruel way, because it has been added almost entirely to the taxation of the poor. Reformers have been engaged in the task of endeavouring to bring down indirect taxation, at any rate to the level of direct taxation. But that was not done in Ireland. *The indirect taxation of Great Britain is under 50 per cent. of the whole. In Ireland is over 70 per cent. of the whole*, and every addition made to the burden of Ireland for the last ten years has been a burden that has fallen upon the poorer classes of the community.

The taxation of Ireland in 1801 (the year after the passing of the Act of Union) was £2,521,219; in 1841 it was £5,077,000; in 1895 it had risen to £7,075,000, although the population had meanwhile diminished by nearly a half; and in 1905 it had further mounted to £8,254,000.

These, be it noted, are Treasury figures, and Irish

Nationalists insist that they vastly understate the case; but Great Britain is the book-keeper, and, for the time being, those figures must be taken as accurate. One fact can be challenged by no one—the present system is a bad one for Great Britain, for she is losing heavily on the Government of Ireland; and it is a bad one for Ireland, because she is taxed intolerably to aid in maintaining a method of government which is extravagant, inefficient, and unsuited to her needs. As Mr. Redmond said in January, 1905 :—

“ What a cruel thing it is that while every industry and interest in the country is neglected, while education is starved, while the labourers can get no justice, while the artizans of the towns cannot get decent habitations, while the drainage of Irish rivers is neglected, while Irish railways are the worst and dearest in the world, and nothing is done to improve transit facilities, while the piers and harbours of the country are a disgrace and a danger to human life, and while all these things are so because of want of money—what a scandal and a crime it is that all the while we are supporting the most expensive Government in the world, and are paying from £3,000,000 to £5,000,000 a year more than our taxable capacity warrants as compared to Great Britain. Just think of how Ireland would be transformed if even a portion of this money of which we are annually robbed were spent under the paternal care of a native Government upon some of these matters I have mentioned, instead of being squandered as it is to-day.”

THE UNIONISTS ON THE TAXATION GRIEVANCE.

The Unionists say that as the Government expenditure in Ireland exceeds Ireland's contribution to Imperial expenditure (which is not admitted), there can, therefore, be no grievance. The excessive expenditure in Ireland is, however, chiefly on account of the garrison of military and armed police, and the excessive staff of judges, crown lawyers, and other similar officials, maintained in Ireland for Imperial purposes. This garrison would never have existed at the present day but for the past and present misgovernment of Ireland in the supposed interests of Great Britain and of the Irish "Loyalist" minority. The position consequently appears to be that Ireland is discontented because she is impoverished from past and present over-taxation, and from other forms of misgovernment; and the Unionist answer to her complaints is that she must pay for the maintenance of the system against which she protests! Millions of pounds are wasted every year in the government of Ireland, of which Great Britain contributes about one-fourth.

How much saner and more statesmanlike was the attitude taken up by the *Saturday Review* (Unionist) of 25th July, 1896, immediately after the Report of the Royal Commission on Financial Relations was issued:—

"Ten out of the thirteen Commissioners agree in that we have taken £2,750,000 a year more from Ireland than Ireland ought to have paid. And this fleecing of England's weaker sister has been going on at this rate for something like half a century. According to the finding of a Commission, mainly composed of Englishmen, we owe Ireland considerably over £100,000,000 sterling, a

sum that, wisely expended on light railways, harbour extensions and drainage schemes, would go far, even now, towards making Ireland prosperous. Had this sum been left in Ireland to fructify, it is more than likely that Ireland would never have suffered as she suffered in the early Eighties, and then we should have had Home Rule in a much milder form. But will England, even now, act generously in the matter?—there's the rub. We hope so, and shall press the point in and out of season. The report has yet another bearing; *it explains the existence of the physical force party in Irish politics, just as the illegal levy of ship money explained Hampden's revolt.* Moreover, we want to make friends with the Irish, and that is to be accomplished by giving them what they want, so far as their desires are consistent with higher laws, and not what we think they ought to want."

EDUCATION.

To-day, admittedly, Ireland lags behind every nation in Western Europe in trade, commerce, agriculture, in technical skill, in science, and in art. Why? Is it because the Irish race are less talented than the people of any other race in the world? Anyone who knows anything of the history of the world, and especially anyone who knows anything of the history of the British Empire, will make no such assertion. No; *Ireland lags behind in the race of nations because there is no nation in which education has been so denied, neglected, and starved.* There is not any test of a Government better than this test of education, and the Government

which for a century has denied, neglected, and starved education, is a Government which cannot justify its existence before the public opinion of the world. First of all education was denied altogether and made a penal offence. Then a system of education was established which has no parallel in the whole history of the world.

Primary education is controlled by the Board of National Education, which consists of seventeen nominated members, five of whom are High Court Judges, and scarcely any of whom are Educationists. They dispense the public money, but nobody—not even the Government—has the slightest control or authority over them.

Intermediate Education is administered by a similar Board, and here is what Mr. Wyndham, then Chief Secretary for Ireland, had to say of it in April, 1902 :—

“ Money,” said he, “ has been lavished on Intermediate Education in Ireland. . . . But how can such expenditure be turned to good account when Elementary Education is not levelled up to the necessary standard, when only 55 per cent. of the children attend the schools, and when continuation schools do not exist? Money devoted to Intermediate Education under such circumstances is money thrown away.”

In Technical Education there is to be found a similar inefficiency. Mr. Wyndham’s words are :—

“ In the nine years between 1892 and 1900 sums amounting to £6,276,404 were devoted to technical in-

struction in England and Wales. Ireland lost two years altogether in that period, but in the remaining seven years she was only able to spend £71,900 on technical instruction, and out of that comparatively insignificant sum no less than £55,000 was expended in the last year."

University Education, in a form which the Catholics of Ireland could accept, was denied for a century (although the Conservatives had promised it year after year for a quarter of a century), until Mr. Birrell carried into law the Irish Universities Act of 1908.

In the last four years, from 1902 to 1906, the Education Vote in England increased by £3,374,600. In Scotland during the same period the increase was £619,128, but in Ireland, over the same period, the Education Vote increased by only £92,223. An Equivalent Grant of £185,000 a year is due to Ireland in connection with the Education Bill of 1902, but it was annexed for other purposes, and practically none of it has been devoted to primary education in Ireland.

Another anomaly was that prior to last year the amount to be spent upon Intermediate Education in Ireland depended upon the amount of whisky consumed by the people! More than half of the income of the Intermediate Board in Ireland came from the whisky tax. There has been a wave of temperance, to the delight of everybody, flowing over these countries. What has the result been in England? Did that wave of temperance reduce by £20,000 a year the Intermediate Grants? It did not reduce them by one penny; whereas in Ireland for the last four or five years, the diminution in the

consumption of whisky had this direct result, that the grants for Intermediate Education were reduced by about £12,000 to £15,000 a year, and one could not even raise the question for discussion in Parliament, because there was no Vote on the Estimates which would enable it to be done. Little wonder that in their Report to Parliament for 1910-11, the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland describe the financial outlook as alarming.

What Ireland wants is a Department of Education responsible to the public opinion of Ireland. That is the only possible remedy, but it is not possible so long as Ireland is deprived of the right of self-government. To abolish the Board, and to put their absolute power into the hands of a new ring of irresponsible officials in Dublin Castle, would be to alienate still more the confidence of the Irish people.

THE RESULTS OF IGNORING IRISH OPINION.

Every year in the last century this Parliament has proved its incapacity or unwillingness, or both, of passing legislation satisfactory to Ireland. Take as an example the Land Act. On that question Parliament passed some forty or fifty Land Acts, but so ignorant was Parliament of the task and of the real meaning of the problems which it had to grapple with; so incompetent was it for the task of governing Ireland; so deaf was it to the voice of the Irish Members—that all these forty or fifty had, one after another, to be “scrapped.”

Or take the Report in 1906 of the Commission appointed

by Lord Dudley to inquire into the state of the Poor Law in Ireland. The Commissioners trace back the history of the Poor Law in Ireland, and show that in the year 1836—
 1836
 seventy years ago—a Royal Commission was appointed composed of some of the most eminently capable men in Ireland, to consider the question, whether the English Poor Law system was suitable to Ireland, and ought to be extended to that country. The Commission reported unanimously that it was unsuitable, and ought not to be extended to Ireland. Lord John Russell, who was Home Secretary at that time, was not satisfied, and he asked a Member of the Poor Law Commission in England, who was an Englishman, who had never been in Ireland in his life, to pay a short visit to that country, and form his own impressions. This stranger spent three weeks in Ireland, and came back with the recommendation to Lord John Russell that the unanimous Report of the Royal Commission should be thrown on one side, and that the Government should extend the English Poor Law system to Ireland. Lord John Russell tore up the Report of the Irish Royal Commissioner, and acted upon the report of this English gentleman. And now, seventy years after, the Commission appointed by Lord Dudley unanimously report that, from the commencement, the English Poor Law system was quite unsuitable, that it has been a ghastly and costly failure, and they recommend the Government to abolish it. No wonder that the people are still emigrating from Ireland, when we have at one and the same time the most extravagant, and the most inefficient Government in the world.

1906

LORD DERBY ON ENGLAND'S CONCESSIONS.

“It is by no means clear to the unprejudiced observer that any gratitude has been earned (in the dealings of England with Ireland). Why have we altered the Land Laws? To put an end to Irish agitation? Why have we cared to put an end to Irish agitation? Because it was not only discreditable to England as a ruling power, but a practical obstruction to the transaction of English business. Fixity of tenure has been the direct result of two causes—Irish outrage and Parliamentary obstruction. The Irish know it as well as we. Not all the influence and eloquence of Mr. Gladstone would have prevailed on the English House of Commons to do what has been done in the matter of Irish Tenant Right if the answer to all objections had not been ready, ‘How else are we to govern Ireland?’ . . . In the history of English relations with Ireland it has always been the same. *By an unfortunate fatality every concession made to the weaker State has been under pressure.*”

LORD SALISBURY ON IRISH GOVERNMENT.

The verdict of the late Marquess of Salisbury in 1865 was as follows—

“What is the reason that a people with so bountiful a soil, with such enormous resources (as the Irish), lag so far behind the English in the race? Some say that it is to be found in the character of the Celtic race, but I look to France, and I see a Celtic race there going for-

ward in the path of prosperity with most rapid strides—I believe at the present moment more rapidly than England herself. Some people say that it is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion; but I look to Belgium, and there I see a people second to none in Europe except the English for industry, singularly prosperous, considering the small space of country that they occupy, having improved to the utmost the natural resources of that country, but distinguished among all the peoples of Europe for the earnestness and intensity of their Roman Catholic belief. Therefore, I cannot say that the cause of the Irish distress is to be found in the Roman Catholic religion. An hon. friend near me says that it arises from the Irish people listening to demagogues. I have as much dislike to demagogues as he has, but when I look to the Northern States of America I see there people who listen to demagogues, but who undoubtedly have not been wanting in material prosperity. It cannot be demagogues, Romanism, or the Celtic race. What then is it? *I am afraid that the one thing which has been peculiar to Ireland has been the Government of England."*

WHAT AN IRISH PARLIAMENT MIGHT DO.

Evidences of the neglect of Irish interests could be supplied to a wearisome extent. Fisheries, Canals, Harbours, Housing, Education, amongst the number. Take, for example, the question of Arterial Drainage. Ruin and desolation have spread over a vast area, extending into five counties in Ulster, by the floodings of the Bann, and whole

families have frequently been driven from their homes to seek shelter and safety on higher ground. Large areas are flooded to the depth of 2 ft. 6 in. for seven months of the year. The flooding of the Owenmore in Sligo lays waste thousands of acres, and 600 families are annually affected by it. The Suck, which runs through Roscommon and Galway, spreads ruin broadcast. The Barrow drains one of the largest areas drained by any Irish river. Its drainage area consists of 480,000 acres, and of these 46,000 acres are regularly flooded. Great injury is done by the floodings of the Barrow, not merely to the lands, but to the towns of Athy, Monasterevan, Portarlington, Mountmellick, and others, and the general health of the whole district is affected. Royal Commissions have sat upon the question and made reports, but all in vain. The facts are indisputable, but the answer from successive Governments is always the same—No money! Belgium, where the cost of government is half that of Ireland, has spent £16,000,000 on drainage works in the last twenty-five years; but in Ireland, under British rule, though overtaxed millions every year, every demand for a great scheme of arterial drainage is met by a non-possumus.

RAILWAYS AND TRANSIT.

Again, the utterly defective condition of railway and transit facilities is the most serious of all the causes which keep Ireland in a state of chronic poverty. The rates of carriage in Ireland must be reduced fully 50 per cent. before profitable employment can be provided for the people of Ireland and emigration stopped. It is beyond dispute that

nine-tenths of the ordinary agricultural products consumed in the English markets, and which are produced, or could be, in abundance in Ireland, are supplied by foreign producers, and the reason is perfectly clear. It is because in every country in Europe enormous decreases have been effected in rates of carriage during the last twenty-five years, while in Ireland freights to-day are still monstrously and prohibitively high. Recently a woollen factory was established in the town of Galway. They get all the coal they require from England. But in the next county, in Arigna, in the County Roscommon, there is plenty of just the class of coal they require to be had at 8s. 6d. a ton, but the carriage from Arigna to Galway is 13s. 6d., which makes the price considerably more than that of the English coal. The question of Irish railways has been discussed by several Royal Commissions, which have recommended nationalisation, State purchase, amalgamation, and other remedies, but which have never led to any practical result whatever.

WASTE LANDS.

Or take the subject of waste lands in Ireland, which are capable of reclamation for agriculture. It is estimated that the cost of reclamation would be £6 10s. per acre, or £9,750,000 in all. Reclamation of waste land in other European countries, which are, however, self-governed, has been carried out on far larger scales at a far greater cost. The Dutch Government drained Lake Haarlem, transferring it into 45,000 acres of meadow at a cost of £19 an acre, and they pumped out about half a million acres of the Zuyder Zee at a cost of £18 an acre, and the work was so reproduc-

tive that they sold the land after reclamation at £34 an acre. Does anyone suppose that a National Government in Ireland would be less ready than the Dutch Government to undertake the far less heroic schemes of reclamation which would so greatly develop this country?

AFFORESTATION.

Forestry is another neglected national resource. Mr. Howitz, the eminent Dutch Forest Conservator, who gave evidence before the Eardley-Wilmot Committee of the House of Commons in 1886, made a special report on Ireland, and declared that had the forests of Ireland been protected and fostered they would now represent the value of £100,000,000. In every other European country forests are regarded as a great national asset. In Ireland they have been ruthlessly destroyed. It has been estimated on the basis of calculation by Mr. Howitz and various experts, that there are 3,000,000 acres of land in Ireland which could be profitably planted, and it is calculated that though such an operation would need an annual expenditure of a large sum for twenty-five years, that at the end of that time there would result an annual profit of about £3,000,000 a year. This operation also would be easy had Ireland at her disposal for works of national utility the millions which are now wrung from her every year, and expended without a thought of the well-being of the nation.

IRISH CAPACITY FOR GOVERNMENT.

In nearly every country in the world Irishmen have shown their capacity for government. In every country but their own the Irish race have been industrially successful, have

risen to the highest positions, and have shown themselves well fitted for the arts of government and of industry. They have given to the British Empire some of its greatest Statesmen, Generals, Diplomats—men like Henry Grattan, Edmund Burke, O'Connell, Parnell, Gavan Duffy, Duke of Wellington, Lord Roberts, Lord Kitchener, &c. Can it be argued that the Irishman abroad is always at home, and that the Irishman at home is always abroad?

THE SUCCESSFUL WORKING OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Mr. Gerald Balfour, who conducted the Irish Local Government Act of 1898 through Parliament, said at the time :—

“ If the councillors do their work with business capacity, and in a spirit of toleration, it will mitigate one of the arguments which had always been felt to tell heavily in England against Home Rule.”

The same Mr. Gerald Balfour said, on the 24th March, 1900 :—

“ I am of opinion that the Act has been successfully worked, and that the local bodies have shown themselves not unequal to the heavy task imposed upon them.”

Later on Mr. George Wyndham declared, on the 27th February, 1902 :—

“ This Act effected nothing less than a social revolution. It took the political power in the matter of local affairs out of the hands of one class, and gave the whole

of it to the other classes. In respect of economy and efficiency that "social revolution has not been a failure. It has exceeded the expectations of the most sanguine."

The Report of the Local Government Board for 1901 declared :—

" The duties (of the local authorities) have been satisfactorily and creditably discharged, not in one part of Ireland, but throughout all Ireland."

The Report for 1902 said :—

" The term of office of the first County Councils and Rural District Councils, on whom, with their officers, rests the credit of having successfully assisted in carrying the Local Government Act into operation, expired in June, and the new Councils, with the experience of the past three years, will, no doubt, endeavour to bring the system into a state of even greater efficiency. Attention has been directed to certain political differences which have been introduced by some of the smaller bodies into their ordinary business transactions, but it is only fair to state that these cases have been quite the exception, and not the rule. They have been promptly dealt with, and we feel confident that the conduct of their affairs by the various local authorities and their officials will continue to justify the delegation to them of the large powers transferred to their control by the Local Government Act. In no other matters have the Councils been more successful than in their financial administration."

The report of 1903 follows similar lines. It states :—

“ The general administration of the Local Government Act by County and District Councils continues on the whole to be satisfactory, and the manner in which the several local bodies transact their business calls for no special observation. The collection of the rates has been efficiently carried out. Very great and most creditable improvements have taken place in the care of the sick during past years.”

The Reports of the Government from the passing of the Act right down to the time when the Tories left office tell the same tale.

Since the establishment of Local Government in Ireland, the average total county rates for the whole country have been reduced by threepence in the £, and during the same period there was an increase of over 10 per cent. in Imperial taxation.

COERCION, THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE.

The only alternative to Home Rule is Coercion, and, as John Bright said, “ Force is no remedy.” Since the Act of Union there have been twelve Acts for the suspension of habeas corpus; 19 Peace Preservation Acts, whether so-called or otherwise; 19 Acts for limiting and controlling the possession of arms and gunpowder; 17 for the prevention of resistance to the law by means of outrages against persons and property; 26 against unlawful and dangerous societies, combinations, assemblies, and processions; 11 for the suppression of rebellions, insurrections, and disturbances; and 2 for curtailing the freedom of the Press.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Another Tory panacea is Redistribution. They say Ireland is largely over-represented in the Imperial Parliament. Tested on a population basis that is quite true; but *the Act of Union guaranteed a perpetual Irish representation of 100 Members*. If Ireland had then obtained a representation on the basis of population, she would have had 230 Members instead of 100, so that if Ireland is getting over-representation now, she was under-represented for half a century.

A HOME RULE REFERENDUM.

Driven from the Redistribution refuge, the Unionist says:—"Well, let us have a Referendum!" They have had many Referendums since the Liberals adopted Home Rule in 1886; and if they want any further test, let them take a Referendum of the Irish people, who have the best right to say how Ireland should be governed.

IRELAND AND BRITISH SOCIAL REFORM.

Lecky has placed upon record that for the last half of the nineteenth century not a social reform for the benefit of the English masses would have found its place in the Statute Book had it not been for the casting votes of the Irish Members at Westminster. They were, in fact, the great driving power in the cause of progress, and were for nearly a century the only Democratic Party in Parliament.

Lecky's words were (*History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, vol. viii., p. 483):—

“ A majority of the Irish members turned the balance in favour of the great Democratic Reform Bill of 1852, and from that day there has been scarcely a Democratic measure which they have not powerfully assisted. When, indeed, we consider the votes they have given, the principles they have been the means of introducing into English legislation, and the influence they have exercised upon the tone and character of the House of Commons, it is probably not too much to say that their presence in the British Parliament has proved *the most powerful of all agents in accelerating the Democratic transformation of English politics.*”

Contrast with that the record of the Ulster Tories, who never once threw in their lot with any measure for the uplifting of the working-classes or the poor, but have ever been—and are to-day—the advance guard of Reaction.

PARSON AND SQUIRE IN IRELAND.

If the Parson and the Squire are predominant in English villages, there is an even worse Ascendancy in Ireland. The Episcopalians, the adherents of the once Established “ Church of Ireland,” form over a tenth of the population, but hold about the bulk of the Government positions, whether of honour or of emolument. *The Irish Nonconformists—Presbyterians, Methodists, &c.—are excluded as rigorously as the Catholics.* The Episcopalian opposition to Home Rule is

merely a fight for the loaves and fishes, and is characteristic of every Ascendancy. Until the passing of Mr. Gerald Balfour's Local Government Act for Ireland, the Episcopalians also controlled, through the defunct Grand Juries, the local government of every county in Ireland; and even in the most Catholic counties it was an event of the rarest occurrence to appoint a Catholic even to the most menial office. What the Tories really fear is that the majority may treat the minority as the minority treated the majority. As John Bright once said in the House of Commons:—

“ These Ulstermen have stood in the way of improvement in the franchise, in the Church, and in the Land question. They have purchased Protestant ascendancy; *and the price paid for it is the ruin and degradation of their country.*”

When the disestablishment of the Church was proposed, Irish Protestants threatened civil war, exactly as they are doing to-day, and with exactly the same seriousness of intention; but it was not for religion they were proposing to fight. The Rev. Henry Henderson, of Holywood, one of their chief spokesmen, said, before a great Orange meeting at Saintfield, County Down:—

“ It was right they should tell their English brethren the truth. It was right they should tell them that so long as there was Protestantism in the land, and a Protestant Sovereign occupying the throne, *so long must there be Protestant ascendancy.*”

The maintenance of the Union means keeping a grip on the

spoils of office, and thus whenever any citadel of Protestant ascendancy is threatened, Irish Protestants come over to England and declare, as they are declaring to-day, that their lives and liberties are in danger.

The Episcopalians form, as has been said, only a tenth of the population, but according to the Parliamentary Return of 1910 there are 807 Episcopalian Justices of the Peace, and only 251 Catholics, 157 Presbyterians, 38 Methodists, and 19 "various"; whilst of the Lords Lieutenants and Deputy Lieutenants of Counties at least eight in every ten are Episcopalians. The Irish Privy Council consists of 43 Episcopalians, 10 Catholics, 9 Presbyterians, and 10 others. The Stipendiary Magistrates include 41 Episcopalians, 19 Catholics, and 6 Presbyterians. The Judges of the High Court number 7 Episcopalians, 4 Catholics, and 2 Presbyterians; whilst the Land and Estates Commissioners consist of 3 Episcopalians, 2 Catholics, and 1 Presbyterian. The County Inspectors of Police are 37 in number, of whom only 4 are Catholics, and nearly all the others Episcopalians. It may be added that when the Tories went out of office in 1905, the Assistant Land Commissioners, Inspectors and Assistant Inspectors were constituted of 39 Episcopalians, 16 Catholics, and 12 Presbyterians, whilst the Recorders and County Court Judges included 10 Episcopalians, 8 Catholics, and 2 Presbyterians; but the Liberal Government has reduced the disproportion under the last two heads.

The extent of the various religious denominations in Ireland, according to the 1911 Census, is : Catholics, 3,238,656; Episcopalians, 575,489; Presbyterians, 439,876; Methodists, 61,806; all others, 66,124.

THE "SEPARATION" BOGEY.

Ireland has always had a "separate" Government, and she has it to-day; what she wants is to reform the present cumbersome and extravagant and deadly system, and to have control of her own affairs. But Separation, in the sense in which Tories use the term, is one of the silliest of bogeys. No sane man in Ireland wants Separation. Irishmen have had a large part in the building up of the Empire, and they have not the remotest desire to sacrifice their share of the heritage. They may be knaves, mercenaries, or anything the Tories like to name them; but nobody has ever called them fools.

Further, every sane man in Ireland knows that Great Britain will never consent to separation: and Ireland if she desired it could never achieve it, because she is so easily within reach of Great Britain's enormous strength. A few thousands of Boers could defy the British Empire because they were protected by distance; rebellion in Ireland has never been successful, because Ireland was so accessible, and with the march of Science Ireland is ten times nearer England to-day than a century ago.

The argument that Home Rule cannot be granted because Ireland is so near is contrary to common sense. Ireland's nearness is the best guarantee against the possibility of Separation.

Even if she wanted it, she could not get it. Great Britain has a population of forty millions, with an Army on which she spends over £34,000,000 a year and a Navy which costs over £38,000,000 a year; whilst Ireland has a population of four millions (from which the pick is taken by emi-

gration) with no Army and no Navy, without a Dreadnought, a machine-gun, or even a pop-gun. If the English Tory, with his forty million people and all their resources, is afraid of the Irishman with his four million people and no resources, it speaks volumes for the courage of the Irishman, but it does not say much for the English Tory.

As Dean Swift once said: "Twelve men fully armed should always be equal to one man in his shirt."

It is also said that a foreign army might land in Ireland under Home Rule. A foreign army might land to-day, so far as that is concerned. The only difference is that, with Ireland disaffected, the invaders might find a friendly population; but with Ireland contented and self-governed, does anyone outside Colney Hatch imagine that they would want the Germans to come in?

THE "DISLOYALTY" BOGEY.

Irishmen are not disloyal to the Throne, but they are disaffected towards the system of government which has caused such havoc and ruin to their country. Mr. Redmond said in one of his speeches in Parliament:—

"I ask the House of Commons what race of men who are not both fools and slaves would be loyal to such a system of government as I have outlined? Sir, the history of the Empire, if it proves anything, proves this, that loyalty has been the result and not the forerunner, of the concession of self-government. Where you have given self-government, there you have loyalty; where you withhold self-government, there you have had disaffection and disaster. Let me ask, Are the Irish to-day

less loyal than were the Canadians, to whom you gave Home Rule when they were rebels with arms in their hands fighting upon the field of battle? Are the Irish less loyal than the Boers, who, the other day, were under arms against the English Power, and to whom you have now given responsible government? Don't you know, every man who is acquainted with the Colonies, that the Colonies of Australia would not be loyal for twenty-four hours if you attempted to govern them from Westminster or from Downing Street? If you have any doubt upon this ask the Colonial Premiers."

An extremist here or there has occasionally made a foolish speech, but has no Tory ever made a foolish speech? King George, as a matter of fact, received—as all the Tory newspapers admitted—a more enthusiastic welcome in Ireland than in any other part of his Dominions. He did not, it is true, receive "official" welcomes, the simple explanation being that whenever they were tendered on previous occasions, the action of the people was always misrepresented by the Tory newspapers as an evidence that the people were quite satisfied with the present system.

It may be recalled in this connection that on the occasion of the Accession of Queen Victoria, Canada was seething in discontent; and that when the Government in this country ordered the *Te Deum* to be sung in Canadian churches, the Canadians rose *en masse* and left the churches. They were actually in rebellion when the Queen ascended the Throne. General Botha, too, was "disloyal" till Home Rule was given to South Africa; so was Australia.

THE REAL DISLOYALISTS.

The real disloyalists in Ireland are the self-styled "loyal minority," who are loyal only to their own interests, and who threaten rebellion every time any part of their Ascendancy is endangered. It is a matter of history that the Orangemen conspired against King William IV., with the object of placing the Duke of Cumberland on the Throne. They threatened rebellion when Gladstone was disestablishing the Irish Church; they threatened rebellion when the Ballot Act was introduced; they threaten rebellion to-day. Individual Irish "loyalists" also spouted the rankest treason when a Member of the Royal Family married the Catholic King of Spain, when the Irish University Act was about to receive the Royal Assent, and on many other occasions. (See section "Loyal Ulster," page 66.)

THE "RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE" BOGEY.

Unionist speakers and writers never weary of dilating upon the dangers to which Protestants in Ireland will be subjected under Home Rule. The political student who wishes to ascertain the facts should, in the first instance, read the pamphlet issued by the Irish Press Agency, 2, Great Smith Street, Westminster, entitled: "Religious Intolerance under Home Rule: Some Opinions of Irish Protestants," in which he will find set forth the personal declarations of large numbers of the leading Protestants of Ireland. A perusal of that document will leave no room to doubt (1) that *Religious Intolerance is practically unknown in the South and West and East of Ireland, where the Catholics are in an over-*

whelming majority; and (2) that Religious Intolerance is only to be found in the North-East of Ulster, where the Orange element holds sway. Yet, it is the spokesmen and champions of that Orange element who, with magnificent audacity, prate of the dangers of intolerance.

The views embodied in that pamphlet include those of the Earl of Dunraven and Sir Horace Plunkett, both Members of the last Tory Government; Judge Rentoul, a former Ulster Unionist M.P.; Lord Pirrie, head of the Shipbuilding firm of Harland and Wolff, the greatest industry in Ireland; the late Earl Spencer, the Marquess of Crewe, and the Earl of Aberdeen, all of whom have held the position of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; Sir Charles Brett, Mr. Edward Archdale, J.P., D.L.; Colonel Sir Nugent Talbot Everard, Bart., H.M.L.; Right Hon. R. G. Glendinning, P.C.; Mr. Walter Kavanagh, J.P., D.L.; Right Hon. Thomas Shillington, P.C.; Mr. Talbot Crosbie, J.P., D.L.; General Sir Alfred Turner, K.C.B.; Right Hon. Sir David Harrel, and scores of Irish Protestant landlords, clergymen, professional men, merchants, farmers, and ex-Government officials.

ROME AND IRISH POLITICS.

The pretended fear of Rome and the Priests is another favourite bugbear with the Tory Party. O'Connell once said that he "would take his religion from Rome but his politics from home"; and his advice was followed on the only three occasions in which Rome directly interfered in Irish politics:

- (1.) When the English Government and the Vatican agreed in 1814 to give the former a veto on the appoint-

ment of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland—an agreement which was smashed by Irish priests and Irish people;

- (2.) When the Vatican in 1883 condemned the Parnell Testimonial, with the result that in a month it jumped from £7,000 to £40,000; and
- (3.) When the Vatican in 1888, at the instance of the Duke of Norfolk and other English Tories, condemned the Plan of Campaign.

In each case the Irish people proved inflexible.

Home Rule, therefore, does *not* mean Rome Rule; if it did, the Duke of Norfolk and the English Catholic community would not be opposing it.

PRIESTS AND IRISH POLITICS.

Mr. J. Annan Bryce, M.P., brother of His Majesty's Ambassador to America, has written an admirable letter in which he says:—

“ It was natural that in the past the influence of the Irish priests should be great. They come from the peasant class, and have a fellow-feeling with its ills, and were the friends (indeed, the only friends) of that class in its long social struggle. They possessed the natural influence given by a better education; and, in fact, in many parts of Ireland the priest was the only educated man whose advice and help the people could obtain. After all, their power has, perhaps, not been so great as that of the parson in rural England, wielding, as the

latter does, the temporal weapon of the deprivation of coals and blankets—a weapon probably more potent in some cases than any mere spiritual menace of what may happen in a future state. Since the Local Government Act of 1898 it has not been found that the priest interferes, unless in the rare cases where there is a question of personal morality, and then not always with success.”

The priest's influence in Ireland is, in fact, both democratic and healthy, and is never used in a narrow sectarian spirit; but his views do not prevail against popular sentiment. To take only three instances : Mr. Redmond was first elected for Waterford despite the hostility of every priest in the constituency; Mr. William O'Brien and his followers were returned at the last election for eight constituencies, although they were opposed by nearly all the priests in the various districts; and Mr. T. M. Healy was defeated in Louth, where he had the sympathy of most of the priests in the Archdiocese, and was elected in Cork, where most of them were hostile to him.

ORANGEISM.

Mr. Goldwin Smith, who is a Unionist, and whose voice is received as the voice of a prophet, wrote in his “ Irish History and Irish Character ” :—

“ The peasantry, though undoubtedly in a disturbed state, might have been kept quiet by lenity, but they were gratuitously scourged and tortured into open rebellion. These were crimes not of individual ruffians but of faction—a faction which must take its place in

history beside that of a Robespierre, Couthon, and Carrier. The murders by the Jacobins may have excited more indignation and pity, because the victims were of high rank, but in the use of torture the Orangemen seemed to have reached a pitch of fiendish cruelty which was scarcely attained by the Jacobins. The dreadful Civil War of 1798 was the crime—as a candid study of its history will prove—not of the Irish people, but of the Orange terrorists, who literally goaded the people into insurrection.”

This is the faction who in Ireland to-day are the instigators and the promoters of the more violent and unreasoning features of the agitation against Home Rule. That faction instigated religious differences—one of the greatest crimes that men could be guilty of. They invoked religious hatreds in order to destroy the Parliament of Ireland, and to-day precisely the same agencies are at work. Religious fears and differences are availed of in support of the Union by men whose fathers’ bigotry and intolerance brought about the Union.

MR. REDMOND’S “STRONG HAND” SPEECH.

The Unionists, by wilful misrepresentation, are alleging that, in one of his speeches, Mr. Redmond threatened that “the Ulster Unionists would be overborne by the strong hand.” What Mr. Redmond did say at Coalisland, County Tyrone, is as follows :—

“Let me say that so far as what I call to-day the minority in Ulster is concerned, that it should be our

greatest and most sacred duty to go to any length short of surrender of principle to disarm their hostility and to remove their suspicions. I admit fully that the minority in Ulster is rich and influential. I admit that it has been powerful enough in the past to stand between Ireland and Home Rule, but its power is waning. But, while I am convinced that we can, if we are put to it, win Home Rule in spite of this minority, I confess to you that I don't want Home Rule for Ireland to come in the garb of a bitter political defeat for any intelligent and honest section of my countrymen. I know, of course, that there is *one section* of the minority opposed to us that has no title to the names of honesty or intelligence, a section that it is impossible, hopeless, to conciliate or placate, a section that will, I believe, to the bitter end continue their policy of hatred and ascendancy. I am not speaking of them. *After all, in reality they are only a handful even of the Protestants of Ulster, and I fear that they must be overborne by the strong hand.* But I am speaking of the overwhelming majority of those who are ranked to-day as our opponents in Ulster. For my part, I say here, that of the overwhelming majority of these men I believe that they are honest and, according to their own sense of the word, patriotic. I believe that they are in large numbers honestly afraid to trust their property and their religious interests to their fellow-countrymen. Now, over these men, I say to-day, that if I can avoid it I want no party triumph. I want to influence their intelligence, I want to dissipate their suspicions, and I want to soften their hearts, and therefore, so long as it is possible for me to do so, even against

hope, I will preach to them the doctrine of conciliation. I say here to-day that *there are no lengths, short of the abandonment of the principles which you and I hold, to which I would not go to win the confidence of these men, and not to have them lost to Ireland. There are no safeguards which I would object to in a Home Rule Bill to-morrow to satisfy the fears which these men entertain*, and he is the best Irishman who does his best to-day by preaching toleration and conciliation, to bring all the sons of gallant Ulster into line in the battle for Ireland."

THE "LAWLESSNESS" BOGEY.

Efforts are made to depict Ireland as a country in which lawlessness is rampant. Ireland, as a matter of fact, is more free from serious crime than any country in the civilised world. There is a custom under which a Judge is presented with a pair of white gloves when there is no criminal business to go before him; and it is safe to say that there is not a Judge in Ireland who has not received more white gloves than the united Judges of England. There is more serious crime in any English county in a month than in all Ireland in a year; and the Judicial Statistics of the two countries show that the small amount in Ireland is steadily decreasing, whilst the large amount in England is steadily mounting up.

How cruelly unjust, therefore, to represent Ireland as crime-ridden. There has been practically no cattle maiming in Ireland for a generation; in one year, 1908, there were outbreaks in England at Jarring Neville (Sussex), Grimsby,

Norfolk, Great Wyrley (Staffs.), Swaffham and Sporle (Norfolk), Bidston Moss (Liverpool), Eye Green (Peterborough), and Darlaston (Staffs.). No Irishman recalls these horrible facts as a reproach to the English people, but they demonstrate the facility with which such charges can be levelled against a whole nation. Fuller details on the lawlessness "argument" are to be found in the pamphlet on "The Criminality of England and Ireland," which may be obtained from the Irish Press Agency, 2 Great Smith Street, Westminster. It may be added that a police record is kept in Ireland of what are called "agrarian offences," which consist mainly of anonymous abusive or threatening letters—many of which are sent in "practical joke," and many are written and posted by the men to whom they are addressed! Several such cases have been exposed in recent years.

At the Summer Assizes in July, 1911, the Judges in nearly every county congratulated the people on the almost complete absence of serious crime.

In reply to an argument which has been, and will no doubt be put forward by those who evidently do not relish this evidence—that the generally quiet condition of Ireland is only temporary, and part of the Nationalist tactics adopted now that Home Rule has come to the front, we would remind our readers that this is the fifth Assizes of which we have kept a record, with practically the same result. At the Spring Assizes in 1909 at least 25 Grand Juries were congratulated on the satisfactory condition of their county and city. At the Summer Assizes in the same year similar congratulations were extended to 27 Grand Juries, at the Summer Assizes in 1910 to 2 Grand

Juries, while last Spring at 32 Assizes out of 39 the Grand Juries were congratulated on the peaceable condition of their districts. Thus it can be seen that the improvement is no sudden or temporary one. It is due to several causes, chief among which are the settlement of the land question and five years of Liberal administration, and of government (as near as is possible under present conditions) according to Irish ideas.

“ THE CATTLE-DRIVING ” BOGEY.

Some people labour under the delusion that the process of cattle-driving involves cruelty to the animals. Nothing could be further from the truth; the cattle are merely turned adrift or driven a few miles away. It is an illegal but peaceful protest against the Grazing Ranch system in the Congested Districts

The connection of cause and effect was plainly set forth by the “ Sydney Bulletin,” one of Australia’s leading papers, in an article published July 6th, 1908 :—

“ In the most fertile parts of Ireland it has been discovered that cows pay better than men, women, and children; so men have been driven off to make room for cows. Over large districts practically the only places where land can now be hired at all for agricultural purposes are in the bogs—regions which were regarded as uninhabitable till this crisis arrived. The situation of the dispossessed Irish agriculturist has become incredible. He used to find a refuge in the United States, but the United States has now the most rigid laws on

earth for the exclusion of pauper immigrants. There is no surplus work in the Irish towns. The English towns are already swarming with unemployed. The Continents of Europe and South America are closed to him through lack of knowledge of any foreign language. His world has shut in upon him, and, for want of other resources, he rents twenty acres of bog, at a hideously high price, considering the quality of the land, and tries to wrest a living out of what is not much better than a quicksand. He is allowed to live on the bog (at a price) because Cow would die there; in a great part of his own country there is nothing for him save the leavings of Cow. Naturally enough, he makes occasional protest. According to the English law of property, Landless Man has no rights. If the landlord orders him to move off one half the earth, he must move on to the other half; and if some more landlords order him off the other half also, he must move into the sea—he can't stay on the high-road, because that would be 'loitering,' and in the public parks there are signs ordering him to keep off the grass. It is a wonderful theory, but the victims of it fail to see the point. They hold that somewhere and somehow Man, as apart from Landlord, must have some right of existence on the Globe, and they assert this theory by cattle-driving. The great aggregate Cow, to make room for which Man has been harried into the bogs, is driven away by night to remote places of concealment, and the grazier weeps in the morning because beef has 'riz' in England, and he has no longer any beef to sell. It is a very mild and patient protest—the French,—with less provocation, drove Louis XVI. to the

scaffold, instead of merely chasing a few bees along a lane. But the ruling class alludes to those parts of the country where man has got tired of starving in a bog as the 'disturbed districts,' and speaks regretfully about 'lawlessness' and such things. The wrong is so gigantic and so shameful that some perfectly humane and orderly people are half inclined to wish that there was a lot more lawlessness than there is."

THE "BOYCOTTING" BOGEY.

Blood-curdling stories are sometimes concocted about the horrors of boycotting, and they are generally garnished with spicy details about the living being starved and the dead being left unburied. In ninety-nine cases in a hundred these tales are either a quarter of a century in age or are absolute fabrications. There is, of course, some boycotting in Ireland, as there is in England. The United Irish League is a sort of Farmers' Trade Union, and it boycotts the blackleg farmer just as the Trades Union in England boycotts the blackleg labourer; but there is no cruelty. It was the late Lord Salisbury who declared at Newport in 1885 that no law could stop boycotting or force men to associate with people whom they were determined to avoid.

THE "ULSTER" BOGEY.

Of all the objections urged against Home Rule by Unionists, the most audacious and most inaccurate is that Self-Government should not be given to Ireland because Ulster does not want it, and Ulster is Unionist and Loyalist,

wealthy and prosperous, comparatively crimeless, and has almost a monopoly of the wealth and culture and education of the country. Let us examine in detail these claims.

UNIONIST ULSTER.

Ulster, first, is not overwhelmingly Unionist—it is almost certain, in fact, that Unionists are in a minority. The population consists of 690,134 Catholics, 366,171 Episcopalians, 421,566 Presbyterians, 48,490 Methodists, and 52,000 others : that is to say, Catholics far out-number the members of any other religious denomination, and are almost equal to all the other denominations combined; and as practically all the Catholics and a substantial minority of the other denominations are Home Rulers, the Home Rulers are probably in a large majority. Home Rulers are certainly in a large majority in five of the nine counties, and form a substantial minority in the other four counties. There is only one County in Ulster, Co. Derry, which has not returned at least one Nationalist Member to the House of Commons; and even in that county the Unionist majority in Derry City was only 113.

Sixteen of the thirty-three Members from Ulster are Home Rulers. It is difficult to extract from the Election Results the exact voting power of the two Parties, inasmuch as some of the Nationalist seats in Ulster have not been contested for many years; indeed, one constituency (West Donegal) is so overwhelmingly Nationalist that it has never had the luxury of a contest, and none of its 6,642 electors has ever had an opportunity of recording a vote in a Parliamentary Election;

but taking the figures in the last contest in each constituency, the official Unionists polled 97,983 votes in Ulster, as against 98,507, exclusive of West Donegal, so that there is probably a large Home Rule majority even in Ulster.

WEALTHY ULSTER.

Ulster is not exceptionally wealthy; it is poorer than Leinster, and very little richer than Munster. In the Rateable Valuation per head of the population the figures are :—Leinster, £4 8s. 9d.; Ulster, £3 9s. 8d.; Munster, £3 4s. 8d.; Connaught, £2 5s. 1d. Taken by counties, the Rateable Valuation per head is higher in no less than thirteen Counties in Leinster and Munster than in the highest County in Ulster (Co. Down). Taking the 39 Counties and County Boroughs of Ireland in order of Rateable Valuation per head, Belfast is 12th, Down 15th, Monaghan 18th, Fermanagh 19th, Antrim 20th, Armagh 21st, Tyrone 25th, Derry County 26th, Cavan 29th, Derry Borough 30th, and Donegal 38th.

PROSPEROUS ULSTER.

Ulster is not prosperous. It has merely been less unfortunate than the other three provinces, and from obvious reasons. The Woollen Industry in the South and West was suppressed by Acts of Parliament; the Linen Industry in the North received Bounties. Moreover, its proximity to the coal ports of the North of England and of Scotland gave other industries a chance; and Belfast became prosperous. The most prosperous industry in Ulster—in fact, in Ireland

—is the great shipbuilding firm of Harland and Wolff, Ltd., the head of which, Lord Pirrie, is a Home Ruler. The prosperity of Belfast was also helped by the long leases which the landlord of the town, the Marquess of Donegal, alone in Ireland readily granted; but unfortunately the growth of population in that city has coincided with a decline of population all over the Province.

There are nine counties in Ulster, and within the last fifty years, whilst the population of Belfast has increased, *the population of these nine counties has diminished by over one million of people, not including those who fled during the period of the terrible Famine of 1847.* In face of that fact, can it be pretended that the population of Ulster is the only prosperous population in Ireland? *That diminution of the population of Ulster is at present greater than the diminution in any of the other provinces,* and the strange thing is that the decrease in population is not the greatest where the people are “thriftless Nationalists”—the diminution is less in the county of Donegal than in those counties which contain a larger proportion of prosperous Unionists. *The highest emigration, in fact, has been from the Unionist Counties of Antrim and Down.* (See Table below.)

From May, 1851, to December, 1906, *no less than 28 per cent. of the total emigration from Ireland to foreign countries was from Ulster,* the percentage from the other provinces being: Connaught 16, Leinster 17, and Munster 35. In other words 66.7 per cent. of the average population of Ulster have emigrated within that period. The returns for 1910 show the following emigration in that year:—Ulster, 12,271; Munster, 8,330; Connaught, 7,598; Leinster, 4,258.

Consider these figures for the Ulster Counties; they are taken from the Emigration Statistics of Ireland, 1910 :—

County.			Emigrants since 1851.	Population in 1841.	Present Population, 1911.
Antrim,	284,209	355,413	478,603
Armagh,	102,790	233,024	119,625
Cavan,	121,185	243,262	91,071
Donegal,	135,125	296,540	168,420
Down,	153,949	368,184	304,589
Fermanagh,	57,816	156,852	61,811
Londonderry,	112,009	222,461	140,621
Monaghan,	78,144	200,516	71,395
Tyrone	144,967	313,011	142,437

Here is an extract from the report of the Census Commission for Ireland in 1901 :—

“ According to the Census returns, the number of persons engaged in Ireland, in the production and distribution of textile fabrics, has fallen away very considerably during the past thirty years. The totals recorded were for 1871, 193,864, and for 1881, 129,787. In 1891 there was practically no change at 129,884, but in 1901 the numbers employed had fallen to 109,588. Referring to the returns for the later year, the Commissioners observe—In this marked decline of over fifteen and a half per cent., the males diminished by 8,864, and the females to the extent of 11,432. Looking at the principal textile manufactures, we find that by far the most

important industry in the country, viz., the flax and linen industry, has lost over 17,000, nearly one-fifth of its workers, while those employed in the manufacture of woollen goods have suffered a corresponding reduction."

Therefore, the decay of Irish industries is going on to this moment, and, further, it is not confined to the south and west and centre of Ireland. Here is proof conclusive in the report of the Commissioners that the industry which has suffered most of all in the last forty years is the linen industry in "prosperous Ulster."

It will thus be seen that there has been *an alarming, a tragic, decrease of population in every county in Ulster except County Antrim*, and a similar decrease would be shown in that county except that the depopulation of the rural parts has been more than counterbalanced by the increased population in Belfast; whilst the emigration even from that county has been greater than from any other county in Ulster.

LAW-ABIDING ULSTER.

Ulster is not pre-eminently law-abiding. The official figures for Ireland in 1909 (the latest available) show of the Indictable Offences in that year 4,534 took place in Leinster, 3,182 in Ulster, 1,516 in Munster, and 641 in Connaught. The Indictable Offences in Co. Antrim and Belfast were higher in proportion than in any county in Ireland except Dublin.

The claims in 1910 for compensation for malicious injuries to property were as follows:—Ulster, 329; Munster, 256; Leinster, 159; Connaught, 107.

EDUCATED ULSTER.

Ulster is not the province of Education and Intelligence. The Census figures for 1911 are not yet available, but in 1901 the percentage of persons over five years of age who were able to read and write was :—Leinster, 83; Munster, 81; Ulster, 79; Connaught, 72—that is to say, Ulster was third in the list of the four provinces.

According to a Parliamentary Return issued in August, 1910, and giving the number of Illiterate Votes recorded in Ireland at the January Elections in that year, there were 12,995 Illiterate Voters in Ulster, whilst the total for all the other three Provinces was 9,510.

MORAL ULSTER.

Of the children born in Ulster in 1910, 3·7 per cent. were illegitimate. The percentages in the other provinces were :—Leinster 2·8, Munster 2·5, Connaught 0·7. Ulster had 1,383 illegitimate births, or half of those in Ireland; and about half of the 1,383 took place in the Loyal and Virtuous County of Antrim. The Nationalist County of Cavan had 22 such cases, Monaghan 35, Fermanagh 38, Donegal 89.

LOYAL ULSTER.

The Ulster idea of loyalty is to threaten to rebel against the King every time that Parliament proposes a reform for Ireland. The threat is worn almost threadbare, for it did duty at the time of Catholic Emancipation, of Disestablishment, of the Muni-

icipal Reform Act, of the Ballot Act, and of the Land Act of 1881. Examples of this "loyalty" will be found in the speeches quoted in the leaflet entitled, "Will Ulster Fight?" published by the Irish Press Agency. Irrespective of the fact that to threaten to rebel against constituted authority is the very negation of loyalty, we have had one Reverend orator who threatened that if Queen Victoria would give the Royal Assent to the Disestablishment Act, "her Crown would be kicked into the Boyne"; another, who boasted that his loyalty was strictly "conditional"; another, who, at the passing of the Irish University Act, charged King Edward with being "in league with the Jesuits"; another, who, in the Belfast Orange Hall, declared that they would "make his Throne rock" if he allowed his niece to marry the King of Spain; another, who declared a few weeks ago that if the Home Rule Bill was passed, the "loyalists" would start a movement for an Irish Republic; and so on.

THE "CIVIL WAR" BOGEY.

Ulster will bluster, but Ulster will not fight—except for the jobs. The same old threats of Civil War are the political stock-in-trade of the Ulster Tories. The newspapers of 1868 and 1869 were full of the most blood-curdling speeches and resolutions against Disestablishment.

Rev. John Flanagan was one of the leading spirits, and the *Northern Whig* of March 21st, 1868, reported him as declaring at Newbliss, Co. Monaghan:—

"If they ever dare to lay unholy hands upon the Church, 200,000 Orangemen will tell them it shall never

be. *People will say, 'Oh, your loyalty is conditional.' I say it is conditional.* Will you, Orangemen of Ireland, endorse the doctrine of unconditional loyalty? (repeated cries of 'No, never'). He then threatened that if the Queen gave her Royal Assent to the Bill, *her Crown would be kicked into the Boyne*, and perorated with the couplet :—

“ Put your trust in God, my boys;
And keep your powder dry.”

Rev. W. H. Ferrar, F.T.C.D., said at Rathmines on March 6th, 1868 :—

“ If the Establishment be destroyed, there cannot, there shall not, there must not, be peace in Ireland. If they think the Protestants of Ireland will succumb without a struggle, they know not the men with whom they have to deal. That I say solemnly before God. If they want us to die as martyrs, we will die as soldiers.”

The Duke of Manchester presided at a meeting in Portadown, where Rev. Thomas Ellis said in May, 1868 :—

“ We will fight as men alone can fight who have the Bible in one hand and the sword in the other. We will fight, nay, if needs be, we will die, die as our fathers died before us, as our sons will die who succeed us. Yes, we will die if needs be; and this will be our dying cry, echoed and re-echoed from earth to heaven and from heaven to earth—echoed and re-echoed from one end of Ulster to the other—‘ No Popery, no surrender.’ ”

But it was not confined to the clerics; even the lawyers wanted to die. Mr. Plunkett, K.C., M.P., speaking in Dublin on March 31st, 1869, appealed to the people of England not to drive the Irish Tories to "material and physical resistance," and called the gods to witness that he and his friends were "ready to seal their protest with their blood in martyrdom and battle."

But he did nothing of the kind. He took the first legal job that came along, and finished up in the House of Lords.

Mr. Falkiner, K.C., said on April 15th, 1869:—"We must tell Mr. Gladstone that if they could not valiantly succeed, they could nobly die." Mr. Falkiner died nobly on the Bench.

WAR UNDER DIFFICULTIES.

If the men of Ulster fight at all it will not be with the rest of Ireland, but with each other. The men of Antrim, Down, and Armagh, before conquering Leinster, Connaught, and Munster, will have to take in hand the subjugation of the six other Ulster counties. Ditches will have to be lined, not merely north of the Boyne, but west of the Bann—not merely from Belfast to Dublin, but from Belfast to Donegal, and from Armagh to Derry. In short, the idea of the Unionist portion of Ulster conquering the Nationalist portion is as absurd as the contention that Lancashire could conquer the northern counties of England. Although there are Orangemen in every one of the nine Ulster counties, it is only in Antrim, Down and Armagh that they could assemble in sufficient strength to overawe the local Home Rulers. However, although it is the wildest nonsense to imagine anything of the

kind, let it be understood that the Orangemen in the north-east of Ulster have taken up arms under the command of Captain Craig with a view to the reduction and occupation of the remainder of the province as the result of the repeal of the Union. To begin with, on entering Monaghan the Orange army, or rather mob, would find itself in a country inhabited by 17,000 Protestants and 53,000 Catholics. On pushing forward in Cavan the Orangemen would be amongst 15,000 Protestants and 74,000 Catholics. In Fermanagh, their task of subjugation would be comparatively light, as the Catholics in that county are only fifty-six per cent.; but in Donegal the Orange army or mob, or rather what remained of it, would be simply swallowed up, for in that wildly remote and extensive and inhospitable region, possessing admirable facilities for a defensive warfare, the Protestants are only 34,000 in number, the Catholics being 133,000.

THE MEN AND THE GUNS.

The Ulster Unionists claim to have "promises" up to £100,000 in the event of a Civil War, but promises do not spell performances; and even if it were cash instead of promises, every penny of it would be wanted for the Canteen and Commissariat—not to mention rifles, field guns, ammunition, hospitals, nurses, doctors, transport, wages, clothing, and Dreadnoughts. The £100,000 (promised) would be a mere drop in the ocean. Why, the Boer war cost nearly £300,000,000.

They have, it is true, advertised—like the sound Tariff Reformers that they are—in a *German* newspaper for tenders for the supply of 20,000 rifles. That bluff was tried in 1886,

except that on that occasion they gave a preference to Birmingham; and the wag who advertised next day for the supply of 20,000 rotten eggs to suppress the insurrection had taken the measure of the Ulster Tories.

When this "Civil War" humbug was being trotted out in 1886, the late Colonel Waring, then Orange M.P. for West Down, wrote to the *Belfast News-Letter* on May 20th of that year :—

"Our motto is 'Defence, not Defiance,' and when I see that the plan of campaign indicated for the Ulster forces is one which it would tax severely the whole strength of the British Empire to carry out, I can feel no surprise that its announcement calls up *a smile of derision on the lips of our enemies, and a blush of confusion to the cheek of sober and sensible friends.*"

And Judge Rentoul, who was in 1886 the Orange Member for East Down, has since written (in June, 1911) :—

"I have spoken on many hundreds of Unionist platforms in all parts of England and Scotland, and have spoken for and with a large proportion of the Unionist Members of each of the four Parliaments in which I sat, and for, at least, half of the members of the Governments of my Party; and there are two arguments which I never used in my life, nor was, I believe, ever on the platform with an English Member who used them, nor did any man for whom I spoke ever wish me to use them. These arguments were—(1) That there would be danger of religious persecution in Ireland if Home Rule were granted; and (2) that 'Ulster would fight, and

Ulster would be right,' if Home Rule were granted. I thought we had a strong enough case, and enough solid arguments, without using arguments which, so far as I could learn, English audiences did not believe in, and which I thought weakened the good arguments which we had."

A STRIKE AGAINST TAXES.

Some of the orators now say that if they do not betake themselves to "the last ditch" they will certainly refuse to pay taxes to a Parliament sitting in Dublin. The only direct tax they can refuse to pay is the Income Tax, and Income Tax-payers are precisely the class who will not risk sixpence in resisting any Act of Parliament. There is nothing, however, to prevent the Ulster Orangemen from refusing to pay indirect taxes; all they will have to do is to cease drinking whisky and tea, and cease smoking tobacco in any form. But will they?

THE "PATRICK FORD" BOGEY.

It seems strange that, in defence of the House of Lords, electors should be asked to show their horror of those American dollars for which the Peers themselves, in their matrimonial alliances, have shown a distinct weakness; but have we not heard of Mr. Patrick Ford before?

When Sir Henry Matthews, Home Secretary under a Conservative Government and now Lord Llandaff, contested the borough of Dungarvan, who nominated him? *Pigott*, who afterwards forged the Parnell letters which the *Times* published. Who was his most energetic supporter? *Patrick*

Ford. And whom did the budding Conservative Home Secretary entertain as one of his first guests at the House of Commons? *O'Donovan Rossa!* Little wonder that the *Times* described the Tory candidate for Dungarvan as a "cross between a Fenian and a Tory."

Mr. Ford was, it is true, an advocate of armed rebellion, of the use of dynamite, of, in short, any method that would destroy or paralyse the misgovernment of his country. But that was in 1884 and 1885; and when Gladstone introduced the Home Rule Bill of 1886 he hailed with delight the prospect of peace between the people of England and the people of Ireland, and has since been a convinced and earnest advocate of a constitutional settlement of the Irish Question.

In April of last year, the New York correspondent of the *Daily Mail* flashed across the wires the glad and joyous tidings that "*Patrick Ford is a Tariff Reformer*"; and on that fact the interesting theory was built up by Unionists that Patrick Ford controls the Irish Party, and the Irish Party controls the Liberal Party, therefore Tariff Reform is inevitable! Does anyone imagine that, if that prediction had been fulfilled, there would be one word to-day about Mr. Patrick Ford? Does anyone suppose that, if Mr. Ford collected American dollars for Tariff Reform, the Tariff Reform League would refuse to accept them? If indeed the Tories would publish the list of subscribers to the Tariff Reform League, would it disclose no foreign gold?

These American dollars have been coming into Ireland for more than half a century. Most of them have gone to pay the rent for uneconomic agricultural holdings; for without the generous help of their sons and daughters in America and in Great Britain, the Irish farmers could not have kept

the roofs over their heads. The chief Irish landlords are in the House of Lords—the Marquess of Lansdowne, the Marquess of Londonderry, the Marquess of Clanricarde, the Duke of Devonshire, and dozens of others; but did anyone ever hear of one of them refusing one of these tainted dollars when offered in the form of rent?

Here are a few of the subscribers in the great Dominion of Canada to Mr. Redmond's collection of American dollars :—

The Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., C.M.G., D.C.L., LL.D., K.C., Prime Minister for the Dominion of Canada, who says :—

“ Ireland is the one black spot to-day in the politics of England. Why not give it the same liberty which has been accorded to South Africa ”?

The Hon. Charles Murphy, P.C., M.P., Secretary of State for the Dominion of Canada.

The Hon. C. J. Doherty, D.C.L., LL.D., K.C., M.P., Leader of the Conservative Party in the Dominion Parliament.

The Hon. Sir Lomer Gouin, B.C.L., Prime Minister of the Province of Quebec.

The Hon. Walter Scott, M.P., Prime Minister of the Province of Saskatchewan.

The Hon. Richard McBride, K.C., LL.B., M.L.A., Conservative Prime Minister for the Province of British Columbia.

The Hon. James Joseph Foy, K.C., M.L.A., LL.D.,

Attorney-General for the Province of Ontario, and acting Prime Minister of the Conservative Government.

The Hon. Charles Ramsay Devlin, M.P., Minister of Colonisation, Mines and Fisheries for the Province of Quebec.

The Hon. Robert Rogers, Minister of Public Works for the Province of Manitoba.

The Hon. John C. Kaine, M.P., Member of the Executive Council of Quebec.

The Hon. Duncan McLean Marshall, M.P., Minister of Agriculture and Provincial Secretary for the Province of Alberta.

The Hon. Alexander K. Maclean, LL.B., Attorney-General for the Province of Nova Scotia.

Sir Thomas George Shaughnessy, K.C.V.O., President of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Donald D. Mann, Vice-President of the Canadian Northern Railway.

Richard Bladworth Angus, Ex-President of the Bank of Montreal, Director of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Governor of McGill University.

Byron Edmund Walker, D.C.L., LL.D., C.V.O., President of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, President of the Canadian Bankers' Association, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Toronto University.

Emanuel Devlin, K.C., B.A., M.A., B.C.L., Member of the Dominion Parliament, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec.

The Honourable A. E. McPhillips, President of the Council for the Province of British Columbia.

His Honour Denis Murphy, Judge of the Supreme Court of British Columbia, &c., &c.

TORIES AND HOME RULE.

The simple fact is that “American Dollars” is merely the election cry of a desperate and despairing Party, *who sought and obtained the aid of the Irish Party to defeat the Liberals in 1885; who coquetted with Home Rule at that time under Lord Salisbury as Premier and Lord Carnarvon as Lord Lieutenant; who again flirted with it in 1902, with Mr. Balfour as Premier, Lord Dudley as Lord Lieutenant, and Mr. Wyndham as Chief Secretary; and who were once more nibbling at it during the last month of the Veto Conference.* They were glad to get Irish help before, and they would be glad to get it again—the American dollars notwithstanding. Sir Antony MacDonnell—now Lord MacDonnell—was appointed Under Secretary for Ireland as an avowed Home Ruler by Mr. Balfour and Mr. Wyndham, and with the express approval of Lord Lansdowne; and one of his first duties was to draft a scheme of Devolution—which is a Latin word meaning Home Rule.

It was in 1885 that Lord Salisbury indicated at Newport that he would rather give Home Rule than Local Government, and his Administration gave Local Government in 1889. And it was in 1885 that the late Lord Carnarvon, then Lord Lieutenant, held the historic secret meeting with Mr. Parnell in an empty house in Dublin, and discussed with him the terms of a Tory Home Rule Bill.

The following was the pronouncement of Lord Salisbury at Newport on October 7th, 1885 :—

“Local authorities,” he then said, “are more exposed to the temptation of enabling the majority to be

unjust to the minority when they obtain jurisdiction over a small area than is the case when the authority derives its sanction and extends its jurisdiction over a wider area. In a large central authority the wisdom of several parts of the country will correct the folly or mistakes of one. In a local authority that correction is to a much greater extent wanting, and it would be impossible to leave that out of sight in any extension of any such local authority to Ireland."

In the same speech Lord Salisbury, whose Viceroy, Lord Carnarvon, had with his knowledge been in communication with Mr. Parnell in reference to the establishment of an Irish Parliament for purely Irish affairs, made pointed reference to Mr. Parnell's allusion, in a speech delivered a day or two before, to the position of Austro-Hungary in respect to Imperial Federation, "I gathered," said Lord Salisbury, innocently, "that some notion of Imperial Federation was floating in his mind."

TORY NEWSPAPERS AND HOME RULE.

Even so recently as October, 1910, when the historical Veto Conference was holding its deliberations, the Tory newspapers were preaching Federalism, which means Home Rule All Round.

A correspondent of *The Times*, who signed himself "Pacifcus," put forward in its columns the proposal that the Conference, if it should be unable to settle the constitutional question without arriving at an agreement with regard to Home Rule, should ask leave from Parliament to sit

again with a wider reference, and perhaps a larger personnel. On this *The Times* made the following remark :—

“ The suggestion is worthy of the careful attention of the Unionist Party and of the nation.”

The *Globe* wrote :—

“ It may be that in this larger question may be found a solution of the two chief problems that have long perplexed both the great political parties of this country—the unity of the Empire and Home Rule for Ireland. The paradox that the apparent contradiction of these two policies may settle both on lines which grant to the advocates of both their desire may become a truism before many months have passed. . . Just as by Land Purchase, the Unionist party destroyed the whole agrarian agitation, so by Federalism it can sweep aside and obliterate Parnellite Home Rule. Tariff Reform and Federation together will carry the country. A policy of negation will not carry even the Unionist party itself.”

The *Daily Mail* said—

“ Should the Conference break up, there is hope that the example set by South Africa may once more be followed and a larger Convention be summoned to carry on and complete its work. There need be no sacrifice of principles on either side.”

The *Standard* declared :—

“ For our part, we are prepared to keep an open mind on the project till we know its character, provided always that we do not incur the reproach of abandoning old and tried friends of the Unionist party. There can be no dealing with separation or a replica of Mr. Gladstone’s Bills, but Federalism need not be dismissed in the dark. *It is a fair subject for consideration and discussion.*”

The London *Evening News* confessed that the idea of Home Rule all Round has a great fascination. “ There is no doubt,” it says, “ that if such a policy could be framed by agreement it would have many advantages for England. Under a just and reasonable system we believe that *all the nations and our over-seas possessions would have much to gain,*” and the paper adds that there are indications that it would be possible to arrive at a solution which would satisfy the Ulstermen.

The Parliamentary correspondent of the *Daily Telegraph* wrote :—

“ Can Unionists consent to discuss Devolution on such lines as those sketched, and remain true to the cardinal principles of Unionism? That is a question which many are asking themselves at this moment. And it is an open secret that the Government are prepared to offer a fresh set of terms on a Federal basis. The question is whether there is any possibility of Unionists being able to join in any such general settlement of the Irish question by consent.”

The *Morning Post* was still more outspoken :—

“ Years ago it was suggested in our columns that a Federal system was possible of acceptance subject to certain conditions. It was pointed out, for instance, that there would have to be no ‘beginning with Ireland,’ because exceptional treatment given in one part of the United Kingdom would mean the sanctioning of an anti-national principle. Furthermore, it was pointed out that Ulster would have to be allowed to become, if she so decided, a separate unit. These were the opinions expressed in the columns of the *Morning Post* some years ago, and they are opinions which may certainly be submitted to the consideration of the Unionist party if the Irish question is barring the way to a settlement of the constitutional issue.”

“ The immediate aspect of this question,” said the *Pall Mall Gazette*, “ is the government of Ireland. Unionists must and do admit that there is a larger outlook now than there was seventeen years ago. Thanks to the beneficent effects of Unionist land legislation, the whole aspect of the Irish question has been changed. Practically the land question has been settled by the Wyndham Act. There remains the demand for decentralised administration and an Irish Assembly with greater or lesser powers, as may be advocated, by one party or another. *Is it not possible that the Irish question may also be disposed of by the consensus of the matured opinion of the United Kingdom? All this points to the bringing in of the hoped-for scheme of Imperial unity, and the treatment of Ireland on something like a Federal basis. This would confer on her some of the dis-*

inctive duties which are sought to be imposed upon her by the advocates of Devolution."

Even the *Observer* "toed the line":—

"But there is a changed Ireland and a changed Empire in a changed world. If there is to be no change in the Unionist position a struggle upon the old lines may be attempted, but with not a shadow of probability that it will be attended by the same success. . . . In resisting even a strong and safe scheme of Irish, or general, devolution—in repudiating the federal solution, which is the very principle of union for all modern states dealing with problems like this—the *Dominions will not be with us, and even the party of Preference and Tariff Reform will find itself appealing to Great Britain in vain.*"

The *Daily Express* said:—

"The well-founded opinion is that a settlement means a scheme of Imperial Federation, of Universal Devolution, of Home-Rule-all-Round. Conservative extremists are aghast. They consider that the Tory party is being dished. For our part we are quite indifferent in a matter of such vital Imperial importance to the dishing of one party or another. We believe that general Devolution and Imperial Federation in some form or another will be the outcome of the great Conference. *We are prepared to welcome such an issue because we believe that these are the lines of true progress for the kingdom of the Empire.*"

The *Express*, in reply to a correspondent, further said :—

“ Mr. W. Lawler Wilson, who has taken charge of a movement to combat the spread of the Devolution movement in the Unionist Party, is trying to make our flesh creep with dire prophecy. He takes recourse to the arguments of a quarter of a century ago, when Home Rule meant separation and anti-Imperialism. *We refuse to be frightened.*”

The *World* at the same time had a leading article on “ The Spirit of Unity ” opening with an allusion to the first Union Parliament in South Africa. It went on to say :—

“ The people with whom we quarrel are those Unionists who loudly shout their determination to oppose any settlement of the Irish question by compromise. We believe that they entirely misjudge the situation. What we do say is, firstly, that the review of the Constitution of this country affords a fitting opportunity for considering and discussing the question of the constitutional relations of the whole Empire; and, secondly, that, having regard to the position of parties to-day the Irish question must be interlaced with the Second Chamber question; further, that *to endeavour to settle the Irish question, fraught as it is with great danger to the Empire, is to be not a turncoat, but a statesman; to be not an opportunist, but an observer of the troubled political world in which we live. After all, and Unionist extremists forget it, a question not settled with the consent of the party may some day be settled without it.*”

Commenting upon Federal Home Rule, the Unionist *Glasgow Herald* said :—“ Politics are unquestionably being

lifted into a clearer atmosphere where the stretch of vision is Empire-wide."

The *Sheffield Telegraph* also wrote :—

" If we are wise in time we shall recognise the fact that a reasonable scheme for the Federation of the United Kingdom is, if it can be formulated and adopted, *the only remedy* for the chronic ulcer of Irish discontent, and the only alternative to that real disruption of the United Kingdom."

What trust can be placed in a party whose Press can effect such a right-about-face as has been displayed by the Tory papers?

Now Ready.

Irish National Finance.

By E. A. ASTON.

With 10 large Coloured Diagrams, illustrating
the course of Irish Finance for the past 130
years.

The manner in which the Author employs
Coloured Diagrams to explain his case,
makes this book clear and understandable
to all men, and especially to "the man in
the street," to whom it is dedicated.

Quarto. **1/ = net.** **1/3 post free.**

**Sealy, Bryers & Walker, Mid. Abbey St.,
DUBLIN.**

Only a few copies remaining.

Historical and Political Addresses.

By JOHN E. REDMOND, M.P.

The 19 Addresses comprised in this Volume were delivered during the period 1883-1897, and contain some of the Irish Leader's most striking pronouncements.

Demy 8vo., 390 pages.

6/- *Net.*

**Sealy, Bryers & Walker, Mid. Abbey St.,
DUBLIN.**

The Story of
How Ulster won Tenant Right
is graphically told in

The Ulster Land War of 1770.

Being the History of the Hearts of Steel. By
F. J. Bigger, M.R.I.A., Author "Northern
Leaders in '98," &c., &c.

"Those who would know something of the miseries and struggles of the Ulster farming class in bygone days, of the gallant fights they made for the rights their descendants now enjoy . . . must read Mr. Bigger's book without delay."—*Ulster Guardian*.

"As we read these documents, so strangely reminiscent of incidents that belong to our own time, the repetitions of history occur to us at every turn."—*New Ireland Review*.

Demy 8vo. **2/6 net.** **2/10 post free.**

**Sealy, Bryers & Walker, Mid. Abbey St.,
DUBLIN.**

